C. L. Copy

FEBRUARY 1962

FIFTY CENTS

MONTHLY REVIEW

AN INDEPENDENT SOCIALIST MAGAZINE

Special 64-Page Issue

VOL. 13

ONE DAY'S PAPER 10

THE EDITORS

LIBERTY IN THE WARFARE STATE

CAREY McWILLIAMS

SOCIALISM AND DEMOCRACY

CHEDDI JAGAN

A NOTE ON ERNEST HEMINGWAY —PHILIP STEVENSON

EXPLORING THE COLD WAR —JOSHUA KUNITZ

CONSERVATION UNIT - SRLF
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

CONTENTS | VOLUME THIRTEEN NUMBER TEN FEBRUARY 1962

REVIEW OF THE MONTH: One Day's Paper 433
LIBERTY IN THE WARFARE STATE by Carey McWilliams 446
REPORT FROM ECUADOR by Manuel Augustin Aguirre 456
SOCIALISM AND DEMOCRACY by Cheddi Jagan 461
WORLD EVENTS by Scott Nearing 467
BOOKS:
A NOTE ON ERNEST HEMINGWAY by Philip Stevenson 475
EXPLORING THE COLD WAR by Joshua Kunitz 480

MONTHLY REVIEW: Published monthly except July and August when bimonthly, and copyright, ©1961, by Monthly Review, Inc. Second class postage paid at New York, N. Y.
EDITORIAL AND BUSINESS: 333 Sixth Avenue, New York 14, New York. Telephone: CHelsea 2-6494.
NEWSSTAND DISTRIBUTOR: B. De Boer, 102 Beverly Road, Bloomfield, N. J.
SUBSCRIPTION PRICE: One Year—$5; two years—$9.
By 1st class mail—United States $7; everywhere else $8.
By air mail—No. America $9; So. America $14; Europe $18; Asia and Africa $24.
EDITORS: Leo Huberman and Paul M. Sweezy.

NOTES FROM THE EDITORS

Our main news this month concerns Monthly Review Press where lots of things are happening.

In the first place, we have been working with a book producer on a new type of binding to take the place of what seems to us the unsatisfactory paperback which is so widespread today. We have come up with what we will call MRP's *new flexible cloth binding.* This is, we believe, a great improvement in toughness and durability over paper, and its cost is substantially lower than the conventional hard cloth. The glue will stick firmly and the pages will not come out after handling. The first two books to appear in MRP's new flexible cloth binding are:

(1) *The Present as History: Essays and Reviews on Capitalism and Socialism,* by Paul M. Sweezy. This is a 384-page book which has been priced at $5 since it was first published in 1953. The price of the flexible cloth edition is $2.95, but for MR readers it will be $2 until the end of

(*continued on inside back cover*)

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ONE DAY'S PAPER

We write in the days before President Kennedy is scheduled to deliver his second State of the Union message. We do not expect to learn much about the real state of the union from the message, and we regard it as a certainty that it will contain a good deal that is either untrue or misleading. On matters of importance, official spokesmen for the American establishment have much the same fondness for the truth as the devil has for holy water.

How, then, is one to get a picture of the state of the union? It is an interesting question to which there is no easy answer. Journalists, historians, economists, political scientists, sociologists —in a word those with the training and the opportunities to see the national scene whole and in perspective—are mostly either intimidated by or in league with the powers that be. The honest ones concentrate on telling little truths, the others on telling big lies. No one cares, or perhaps dares, to make a business of telling big truths. And yet, in a way, big truths are the only real truths: Hegel was everlastingly right in insisting that "the truth is in the whole."

The problem, it must be stressed, is not one of lack of information. To be sure, much important information is never made public, but it is hard to imagine a situation in which this wouldn't be so. The problem concerns the use of the vast amount of information that *is* made public. Most of it just lies around unused and soon forgotten. Much of it is absorbed in unrelated dribs and drabs. Much of it is used, awkwardly or artfully as the case may be, to lend versimilitude to official lies and deceptions. What is missing is a consistent effort to fit the various bits and pieces together into an honest and truthful picture of reality.

With thoughts like these in mind, we recently decided to make an experiment. Let us take one day's paper, we said, and let us see what it tells us about the state of the union. So we

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

took the *New York Times* of that day (Friday, January 5th) and went through it carefully, clipping the various items that seemed most relevant. Then we classified them under the following headings: (1) Foreign Relations; (2) Urban Living; (3) The Economy; (4) The Negro Struggle; and (5) Public Morals and Values. Finally, we summarized and interpreted the "source material" thus assembled. Here is the result: judge for yourself how much can be learned from the pages of one day's paper.

(1) Foreign Relations

Let us begin with the most cheerful news of the day, a page-one report from Vientiane, Laos, to the effect that the United States is putting strong pressure on the far-out rightist regime of Prince Boun Oum to force it to live up to its promise to enter into a coalition government with neutralists and leftists under the premiership of Prince Souvanna Phouma. Whether Washington will go through with it is another question, but at any rate the indication of even some small degree of realism and flexibility in that part of the world is welcome. Enthusiasm, however, should be tempered by knowledge of the background. Until about a year ago, there actually existed in Laos a neutralist government under Souvanna Phouma. It was cold-bloodedly doublecrossed and driven from the capital by the Americans, using the Laotian rightists as their instruments. This "clever" maneuver immediately backfired. All self-respecting, not to say progressive, elements in the country joined forces and quickly routed the lavishly equipped and financed but thoroughly demoralized Boun Oum forces. The United States was then presented with the choice of getting bogged down in a hopeless military venture in the Laotian jungles or trying to restore the situation which it had just deliberately destroyed. Washington at least had sense enough not to flee forward into a certain debacle, but its efforts to cut losses and to get out of the trap it had so ingeniously laid for itself were half-hearted and are now being resisted by its own puppets. The mess persists and will continue to, if not in Laos then in other areas where the underlying situation is similar, unless and until Washington stops basing its policies on support for regimes and social systems

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

which history has already irrevocably condemned.

That no such change is under way or contemplated is unfortunately all too convincingly proved by the story in the very next column to the Laos report. The headline reads: "U.S. Giving Saigon New Economic Aid In Fight On Reds." Saigon, of course, is the capital of South Vietnam where (a) one of the rottenest regimes in the world survives solely because of large and growing U.S. financial and military support; and (b) a classic guerrilla movement, supported by all healthy elements of Vietnamese society, is already in effective control of much of the countryside and gaining strength every day. The *Times* story deals with a joint Washington-Saigon communique (printed in full on page 2) which reads as though it had been lifted bodily from some latter-day version of *Alice in Wonderland*. All sorts of dandy reforms, from universal primary education to industrialization, are now going to be initiated, with the finances coming from an increased flow of dollars plus a nice new domestic tax program. All these benefits are to be showered first on the inhabitants of "free" areas and are to be extended to the rest of the country as the guerrillas are eliminated.

Good God! Are the bright young men of the Kennedy administration really so stupid as to think that anyone but the American people will be fooled by such stuff? Don't they understand that the *raison d'être* of the Saigon regime is precisely to resist reform and preserve the privileges of a parasitic ruling class? Don't they know that the only real reformers in Vietnam are the "reds" they are so anxious to suppress? Do they really think that revolutions are made by reactionaries? It is as though Eisenhower and Batista had issued a joint communique promising to reform Cuba in order to defeat Fidel Castro in the closing months of 1958. Would any Cuban in his right mind have taken it seriously? And if not, what conceivable reason is there for expecting any Vietnamese in his right mind to take seriously the Kennedy-Diem communique? No, the handwriting is already on the wall in Vietnam—and in the rest of Southeast Asia, and in Iran, and in much of Africa, and in all of Latin America. How many more defeats and disasters must the United States suffer? Will our rulers never learn?

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Before we leave the area of foreign relations, it will be useful to notice one more item, a three-inch squib on an inside page reporting the return of Cardinal Spellman from a Christmas tour of U.S. military bases in France and Germany. The key sentences read as follows: "Interviewed at New York International Airport, the Cardinal said no one 'on our side of the wall' had a clear idea about the future of Berlin. 'It looks very dubious,' he observed." Yes, it does; and this fact accounts for much that has happened in the last few months. It accounts especially for far-reaching changes in Soviet tactics regarding Berlin and Germany. Before August 13th, East Germany was being drained both economically and psychologically by the unchecked flow of refugees through the Berlin exit hatch. As a consequence, the Russians were demanding ever more insistently that negotiations for a settlement be speedily undertaken. Since August 13th, all that has changed. The drain was stemmed by the building of the wall. East Germany was stabilized, and it became West Berlin's turn to enter a period of crisis and decline. The Russians have quieted down: they can now afford to wait. By the same token, pressure on the West to negotiate is building up. The full magnitude of the bloodless Soviet victory of August 13th is just beginning to unfold.

(2) Urban Living

On page 7 of our day's paper there is a story about the presentation on January 4th of the $20,000 Kaufmann International Design Award for 1961 to Dr. Walter Gropius, the famous architect whose Bauhaus in Germany during the 1920's played a revolutionary role in architecture far beyond the borders of the Weimar Republic. The *Times* reporter quotes from an interview as well as from a speech at the acceptance ceremony:

> The "haphazard, chaotic" growth of cities, restrained "only by zoning laws that merely forbid the worst," is a product not of necessity, but of municipal habits, Dr. Gropius said.
>
> "There is no lack of good planners and designers who really know what could be done to bring about a new unity of design, but they have no power," he said. . . .

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Dr. Gropius said he regretted the demise of "a standard of decency" by which architects and designers sought to sustain the unity of the plazas for new structures. . . .

Under present standards, he said, "it seems completely futile to inject quality into buildings and goods which are created only for their short entertainment value before they are discarded or exchanged for another set of equally ephemeral items."

This devastatingly negative judgment on the physical design of our cities also applies, only more so, to their social aspect—to their comfort and convenience, their livability, their effect on the human beings who inhabit them. And here too we have to do with "a product not of necessity, but of municipal habits." Only one must add, of course, that these municipal habits are in no sense ultimates but are themselves the product of a system in which real power is vested in private property owners each of whom is inexorably driven by the logic of his position to pursue his own individual interest rather than the interest of the community to which he belongs. Adam Smith argued that in such a system individuals seeking their own interest would be led "as though by an invisible hand" to promote the general welfare. As a weapon against the irrational restraints and restrictions inherited from the past, Adam Smith's doctrine had great power and validity in his own day. That it is today a monstrous falsehood can be seen nowhere more clearly than in the shambles of American cities.

An item on page 18 provides an apt footnote. "Crowding Feared Near Lincoln Sq.," says the headline. Excerpts from the story follow:

Two influential organizations urged yesterday that the city [New York] use extreme caution in approving plans for more housing in the Lincoln Center neighborhood.

The Citizens Union and the American Institute of Architects said a comprehensive study of the area should be made before the city approves a vast housing project over the New York Central tracks west of the center.

Both groups said no such study had been made. And both said that without it, the proposed development, in which 25,000 persons would live, would further crowd an already heavily congested section and add to its snarled transportation. . . .

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Another group that expressed concern over the proposed project were the residents of Lincoln House, a middle-income cooperative at Sixty-sixth Street and Amsterdam Avenue.

Norman Marcus, a resident, said that the cooperators felt that the area was already overcrowded and that the city's plan "seems to be to erect housing willy-nilly, without regard to the need for subway-spur extensions and the impossibility of furnishing additional bus facilities on overcrowded streets."

Mr. Marcus was no doubt being facetious when he spoke of the "city's plan." Surely he, like every other good American, knows that in this country we don't believe in planning.

Finally, we are reminded by a story on page 16 of the conditions in which poor people live. "An agent for the receiver of a building," the story begins, "was fined $75 in Housing Court yesterday on a charge that eight tenants had been bitten by rats." How can people read things like that day after day without getting mad enough to do something about it? Or is it perhaps the very commonplaceness of such horrors that makes people accept them with no more than a sigh or a shrug?

(3) The Economy

James Reston devotes his "Washington" column (page 28) to certain imbalances in the economy which he says the administration, or at any rate Secretary of Labor Arthur Goldberg, would like to eliminate. "In Texas, for example, the migrant agricultural workers get 50 cents an hour in some areas, but in New York City the electrical construction workers get $4.40 an hour and are threatening to strike if they don't get $8.68 an hour for a twenty-hour week. That's right: $8.68." He could have found even more striking figures to place alongside the agricultural worker's 50 cents an hour. For example, according to a recent Senate Committee report, the 18 highest paid executives in U.S. industry averaged in 1957 (it would be more now) $261.39 an hour.* That's right: $261.39. But naturally the administration is not worried about *that* disparity.

* We refer to the Kefauver Committee's well known study *Administered Prices: Steel,* p. 108. The hourly rate is calculated on the assumption of a 40-hour week and a 48-week year. Actually, most executives work more hours and fewer weeks.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Mr. Reston proceeds:

In Baltimore recently, the Glenn Martin Company had to lay off 2,500 skilled workers because it didn't get a missile contract that went to North American in California, where there is a skilled labor shortage.

This does not strike the administration as an ideal state of affairs. By last count there were 67,349,000 people employed in this country . . . but at the same time there were 4,000,000 unemployed, and some areas were overworked while others were on the dole.

Arthur Goldberg, the Secretary of Labor, shakes his head. One out of every six jobs in America today, he says, is now situated in Texas, California, or Florida, but in West Virginia and along the Mesabi iron range in upper Minnesota, where many miners have been out of work for five years, the lopsided boom looks a little crazy.

It *ought* to look more than a little crazy to anyone who hasn't been drugged into insensibility by "affluent society" and "free world" propaganda, but maybe such people only exist in places like West Virginia and upper Minnesota. Anyway, there aren't enough of them to cause much concern in Washington. Even Goldberg, who is described by Reston as the "conscience of this administration in the economic field," seems to want nothing but a few minor reforms; and to judge from the record of the last session of Congress, he is not likely to get even that much. Furthermore, it is doubtful whether he thinks the reforms would do much good if they were adopted. According to Reston, "the administration recognizes that the job [of correcting imbalances] cannot be done without the cooperation of labor and management. How this is to be achieved nobody seems to know, but Secretary Goldberg at least is clear about the goal." This estimate of the outlook, to be sure, may be too gloomy in one respect. Goldberg is said to favor more government spending to relieve unemployment, even if it means continued budget deficits. Obviously the Congress is not going to vote more spending for that particular purpose, but there is a way around this difficulty. You cook up an international crisis and a war scare, and Congress immediately comes through with more than you asked for. It worked last year, why not this

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

year? After all, a bigger and bigger arms budget is what the whole crazy boom is built on.

One other item in the day's news seems worth noting in relation to the state of the economy, though its importance is more symbolic than substantive. The complete headline (page 20) is as follows: "Los Angeles Examiner to Close; Mirror There May Also Be Shut. Double Move Would Leave 2 Downtown Dailies—Hearst Would Have Afternoon Paper and Chandlers the Morning." The two papers that are closing also belong to the Chandler and Hearst interests, so that the total range of choice open to the city's inhabitants is not noticeably reduced. Still, it is a very striking fact indeed when the process of newspaper concentration reaches its logical limit in the country's third largest city—one morning paper and one afternoon paper. Long live freedom of the press! Long live competition!

(4) The Negro Struggle

Every day's paper brings news of white repression and Negro struggle. That of January 5th was no exception. It contains, as it were, four short communiques from various fronts in this war which is in the most literal sense a war between the just and the unjust. From Jackson, Mississippi, comes a report (page 18) that the state House of Representatives has "adopted without debate a resolution that would, in effect, bar Negroes from sitting in the galleries of the Legislature." Black looks, it seems, must not be allowed to disturb the labors of the white overlords. From Huntsville, Alabama (also p. 18): "Groups of Negroes staged five sit-in demonstrations yesterday and last night. . . . The demonstrators were quiet and orderly. Many of them carried school books and some appeared to be studying the books while sitting at the lunch counters." Under a Montgomery, Alabama, dateline there appears a story (p. 36) about court hearings initiated by the federal Department of Justice to force Montgomery County voter registrars to cease discriminating against Negro applicants. "A Negro midwife testified that she could fill out birth certificates correctly and could not understand why she had been unable to complete a voter questionnaire satisfactorily." Could it be because filling

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

out birth certificates is not a threat to anyone's power and privileges? The fourth communique (p. 26) appropriately comes from Chicago: it is not only in the South that colored people are oppressed and discriminated against. "Negro pupils protesting a transfer from one predominantly Negro school to another held classes in a school corridor today for the third consecutive day. The demonstration at Burnside School continued despite threats to charge the 18 pupils with truancy for failing to report at Gillespie School."

One of the few things about their country that honorable Americans can take pride in these days is the fighting spirit of an ever growing sector of the Negro citizenry. Threats don't work any more, and they never will again.

(5) Public Morals and Values

New York State's $100-million shelter program, jammed through the legislature so fast that members didn't even have time to read the bill, was itself a major scandal. It is therefore hardly surprising to learn that it is the carrier of other scandals. One of them is aired in some detail in a front-page story which reminds us, if we ever happen to forget it, that corruption is of the very essence of "democratic" government in a society which subordinates everything to money-making. We quote:

A Tennessee industrialist testified yesterday that Alfred Dallago, chairman of the board of Lancer Industries, Inc., had told him more than a year ago that Assembly Speaker Joseph F. Carlino was "in our hip pocket" and was working on fall-out shelter legislation in New York State. Warren C. Adams, president of the Adams Manufacturing Company of Camden, Tenn., which makes shelters, gave the testimony before the Assembly Committee on Ethics and Guidance. He also said that he had been told that he, Mr. Dallago and Mr. Carlino would profit from passage of the legislation. He quoted Mr. Dallago as having said that if the program was passed it would bring tremendous orders for shelters from the state and from individual home owners. . . .

Mr. Carlino became a director of Lancer Industries in July, 1960, and resigned Nov. 15, 1961, six days after the Legislature passed a $100,000,000 fall-out shelter appropriation. Mr. Carlino's law firm had been retained as special counsel to Lancer from

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

September, 1959, to June 30, 1960. Payment for services was made in both cases.

Perhaps it will be argued that politicians are a special breed whose morality is not fairly representative of society's. The argument is not worth much; in fact the contrary position, that a society's morality can best be judged by its politicians, would be much more sensible. But let us not insist, let us instead ask about the morality of a group which is generally thought to occupy a position of special responsibility and trust in society, the scientists. Here, too, the *Times* of January 5th contains valuable evidence. In another page-one story, this one under a Washington dateline, we learn that "the Atomic Energy Commission, on the advice of the Justice Department, is enforcing a strict conflict-of-interest policy limiting the private consulting activities of its scientific advisers." The story then goes on to report that the AEC's position on this matter is much stricter than that of other government agencies, the Defense Department in particular. A spokesman for the Department of Defense is quoted as saying: "Under the commission interpretation [of the conflict-of-interest laws] we would be denuded of our scientific consultants." Why? What is it that makes scientists so anxious to act as consultants to both government and private industry? Here is the answer:

> Commission officials reported that members of the General Advisory Committee [a body of scientific consultants to the AEC] were in high demand as industrial consultants with the offered fees ranging as high as $1,000 a day. Commission officials believe that one reason industry is willing to pay such high fees is to obtain advice on the trend of commission research programs.

Or, to put the matter more bluntly, there are scientists who work for the government in order to get inside information which they can sell at fabulous prices to the giant corporations which batten off the government's multi-billion-dollar arms budget. Why isn't that just as bad as an elected official's helping to push through legislation from which he hopes to derive personal profit? As to businessmen, who constitute the real elite of this society, since they are *supposed* to be devoting themselves to making money, it is taken for granted that there is nothing im-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

moral about their buying politicans or scientists or anyone else who can serve their purpose. What tends to be overlooked is that in so doing they set the moral tone for the entire society. With such things happening at the top, we must expect to get reports like the following (p. 33) from the bottom:

A four-year rise in cases of infectious syphillis in the city took another big upturn last year, the Health Department reported yesterday.

In the first ten months of 1961, the Department said, 2,708 of the 16,287 cases reported were of the early, infectious type. The figure was 29.1 percent higher than the 2,097 infectious cases reported in the same period in 1960.

About 14 percent of the infectious cases occurred among persons under 21 years of age. The continuing increase in this age group is underscored by the figures. In 1957, the Department reported, there were eighty-five cases in the group. In 1961, there were an estimated 454 cases.

Nor are the signs of moral health much more encouraging in the middle reaches of society. This is where the scientists are to be found. It is also where the strategically placed operatives of the mass communications media are to be found. The standards of the latter group may perhaps be inferred from the day's TV review by Jack Gould who enjoys a deservedly high reputation in the entertainment world. The subject of the review is a CBS documentary on East Germany. For many months, it seems, CBS had been trying to get permission to do the documentary. Permission was finally granted on certain conditions. One of them was that Daniel Schorr, who planned the program and supplied the commentary, "had to agree not to foster 'propaganda' for the West." Mr. Gould continues:

But the Communists obviously failed to take into consideration the resourcefulness of Mr. Schorr and the program's producer, Edward M. Jones. Especially through the skill and subtlety of his questioning, Mr. Schorr managed to elicit an immense amount of documentation of the repressive consequences of a closed society.

Once again to put the matter in blunter terms: Mr. Schorr promised not to make propaganda but actually designed the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

whole program as an exercise in propaganda. "By the program's end," says Mr. Gould, "there was no missing Mr. Schorr's central theme: that a Communist state must seal itself off from outside influences if its own influence is to last." Mr. Gould is delighted with Mr. Schorr's performance: how very clever and meritorious to deceive the wicked Communists! The very same Communists, of course, whose most evil characteristic is supposed to be an unlimited propensity to deceive! Mr. Schorr could perhaps plead in extenuation that he was only doing what he had to do to earn a living. But what of Mr. Gould?

The record, unfortunately, is all too clear. Is the outlook any better? This is a question which Dr. Gropius asks and tries to answer. Let us quote again from the story on page 14 reporting his acceptance of the Kaufmann International Design Award for 1961:

> What will it take, he asked, to "extricate ourselves from this merry-go-round" and "rise above the cloud of fake values which is smothering us?"
>
> He answered this himself: purposeful, intensive education.
>
> "It seems to be unimaginable that human nature should not rebel against the conspiracy to replace the 'tree of life' with a sales spiral," he said. "I hope this generation will, by the power of education, produce men who eventually will blaze a trail out of the commercial jungle."

This doctrine of salvation through education has reappeared again and again in the course of history. It is an attractive doctrine which appeals to men of honor and integrity like Walter Gropius. But what of its realism? If education hasn't saved us yet, what chance is there that it will in the future? Education can hardly be better than the schools that produce it. Are they really improving so much that we can expect them soon to begin turning out a new type of human being capable of transcending and transforming a debauched and demoralized society?

Alas for dreams. Schools reflect society, not vice versa. Our schools, and hence the education they provide, are domi-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

nated by the very same fake values that Dr. Gropius wants them to rise above. Dramatic confirmation is to be found on another page of the same paper that reports Dr. Gropius's hopeful views. The lead editorial of the day, entitled "The Heart of the Schools," is devoted to what the editor rightly calls the "fine report" of Dr. Mark C. Schinnerer on the New York City schools. Dr. Schinnerer, says the editorial, "has brought the real crisis back into focus by concentrating his criticism not on education's shell but its heart. His priority recommendations deal with teaching rather than real estate. His emphasis is on the quality of the staff rather than on tables of organization." In this context, how can one exaggerate the significance of Dr. Schinnerer's finding that the present trend is a "blueprint for a school system which is dying?"

Maybe New York is the great exception? Not at all. Read James B. Conant's recently published *Slums and Suburbs* if you are in doubt. Or maybe it is only the schools and not the colleges that are involved? Again, not at all. On this point, the even more recently published volume *The American College,* edited by Dr. Nevitt Sanford of Stanford University, could hardly be more convincing.

No, there is no room for optimism here. The whole educational system reflects the degeneration of public morals and values which Dr. Gropius so eloquently deplores. And how could it be otherwise?

Isn't it time for men of intelligence and honor to face up to the bitter truth that what is wrong with this country is the inhuman social system under which it suffers? And isn't it time solemnly to resolve that no matter how long it may take or what obstacles have to be overcome, this system must and will be replaced by one that accords with the needs and aspirations of human beings?

(January 11, 1962)

There is enough in our ever-swollen granaries so that no American need to go to bed hungry. Yet millions do, while millions of others are vaguely uneasy, and feel guilty about so absurd a situation.

—*W. H. Ferry, The Dilemmas of Abundance, 1961*

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

LIBERTY IN THE WARFARE STATE

BY CAREY McWILLIAMS

Frequently I hear it said, and more often lately than in the past, that we live in a Garrison State. Frankly I do not think that this phrase should be used to describe the present state of affairs, even when it is placed, as it often is, in quotation marks. Somehow I do not get the impression—perhaps because I lead a sheltered life—that we are living in a Garrison State. This ominous phrase carries a connotation of rigid censorship, air-tight controls by an arrogant military, hosts of political prisoners, and, above all, a universal, terrifying silence of the type that reigns in a prison when the guards say "lights out." But when I listen, it is not an oppressive silence that assails me but loud and raucous shouting.

Throughout the year, loud and belligerent voices have echoed from Los Angeles to Sharon, Connecticut, while out of Texas has come a simply frightful din—as always. Here are a few samples. A big-talking Texas publisher tells the President of the United States, to his face, in the presence of guests, that he is a "weak sister" and that the people out the publisher's way—that is out Big D way—think of the President as riding Caroline's tricycle, whereas what the country needs is "a man on horseback," preferably a Texan. Out in Los Angeles, well-dressed ladies from Bel-Air and Beverly Hills unfurl the banner of Mothers for Armaments, and shout the gentle slogan "Be a Hard-core American" as they picket meetings. Unmuzzled reservists, called to active duty, flood the letter columns with protests about the quality of mattresses in the bunks. Obliging Congressmen interview them, and echo their protests, on radio and television. Newspapers which only a few months back were exhorting us to "stand firm" in Berlin, swell the chorus of

---

This is an abridged version of a talk delivered by the editor of the *Nation* at a meeting of the Emergency Civil Liberties Committee in New York on December 5, 1961. The footnotes were added later.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

these protests. A general who would like to ride a horse from West Texas to Washington shouts that he has been muzzled by a wicked clique in the Pentagon. Unmuzzled—in civilian garb—he is given nationwide television time so he may speak out, but alas he proves to be tongue-tied. Out in Arizona, that fine old-fashioned gentleman, W. R. Matthews, publisher of the *Daily Star* in Tucson (which is ringed nowadays with missile bases, all faultily sited up-wind) defies the missiles and the Air Force and, in a shouting editorial, shouts that the Air Force Association is trying to shout us into a war. At its annual meeting in Philadelphia, the Air Force Association virtually declares war on the Soviet Union, and generates so much noise and excitement in the process that a couple of drunken Air Force generals get involved in a fist fight, while platinum blondes in scanty sportswear, worried about national security, explain the complexities of lethal gadgets to attentive Air Force brass. Over the din and the clamor, Association officials get their main point across, namely, that fear of war may well destroy this nation yet. These noises suggest to me not a Garrison State but something that might be called a Cacophony State.

But there are pleasanter noises in the land. Housewives, so young that many of them had probably never seen a picket line until they decided to picket for peace, make their protest heard in twenty or thirty American cities. Professors open their classes with talks on the implications of nuclear warfare. Psychoanalysts momentarily leave the couch, and interrupt their every-hour-on-the-hour schedule long enough to conduct street meetings and sidewalk seminars on the nature of group hostility. Theologians debate the ethics of shooting your neighbor and his children to keep them out of *your* shelter. The most famous of all shelters—the one Dr. Willard Libby built in the backyard of his home in Los Angeles—is set aflame by a brush fire, and what a noise that made! Urged by a chorus of the highest authority to build private shelters, the American people decide *not* to build private shelters. A woman in California sends the United Nations a check for $1,000—the price of the shelter she will not build. In New York, a 26-year-old mother, described as wearing a ribbon in her hair, the daughter of a career Navy officer, sitting in the park with her six-months-old baby in her

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

arms, refuses to take shelter during an alert. "Little men ran around me," she recalls, "the Civil Defense man shouted at me and the cop kept saying he would have to give me a ticket. I was sure I was going to be arrested and was frightened out of my mind, but I didn't move."

Somehow all this shouting and picketing, this defiance and protest, does not suggest to me that we live in a Garrison State. Nevertheless the situation we face is dangerous enough, and more difficult to cope with, perhaps, than a Garrison State. There is no point in citing details; you know the facts: Fred Cook has summarized them in *Juggernaut* (*The Nation,* October 28, 1961). The business of warfare is today the dominant American industry, and by a wide margin. We spend a fantastic sum every minute, every hour, every day on warfare, yet the more we spend the less secure we feel. In brief, warfare has become for us a way of life. We are all caught up in it. We are all its beneficiaries. It matters not at all that 75 percent of all defense contracting is done—60 percent of it without competitive bidding—with no more than a hundred companies. The benefits are shared after a fashion; some seven million American jobs are directly involved. Even those who do not own a single share of Death Rays, Inc., indirectly benefit from the Pentagon's largesse. The key to the situation is to be found in the unpleasant fact that there isn't much protest about it.* We pay our taxes uncomplainingly and diligently move the goods off the shelves of the supermarkets. With rare exceptions, we observe the new version of Poor Richard's maxim: Borrow,

* A simple experiment will test the truth of this comment. Pick the name of a Congressman at random from the directory of the 87th Congress. Phone the Congressman or, better, his administrative assistant. Ask how many letters, communications, memorials, or petitions the Congressman has received from individuals or organizations urging a cutback in arms spending. I have tried the experiment many times and have uniformly been given the answer: "not many." Or carry the test one step further: ask yourself the question, "When did I last write my Congressman urging a cutback in arms spending?" Most Congressmen represent interests, not people, and there is today no organized peace movement with clearly stated *political* objectives; "peace" in itself is not an objective, but a cutback in arms spending—disarmament—would be. The Birch Society and We, the People, flooded Congress with 140,000 letters and telegrams on one issue earlier in the year. The countervailing political pressure was nil.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Buy, Waste, Spend. Most of us are too busy shopping, and consuming, to do much protesting. As a midwest banker said to a reporter from the *Wall Street Journal*: "That noise you hear is not the katydids; it's the sound of all those debts around here amortizing."

Of course one must recognize that the situation which has brought the Juggernaut into being is real enough. We live in a world of obvious dangers. No doubt these dangers have been magnified, but they are not fantasies. It is also true—painfully true—that coercive measures and techniques—inquisitorial committees, loyalty oaths, blacklists, harsh legislation—have served to inhibit protest. The evil heritage of McCarthyism is still very much with us; hardly any of it has been removed. We still have a few political prisoners; not many, but even one would be cause for concern. But even taking these factors into consideration, it should be clear that it is the carrot, not the stick, that keeps us in line. Liberty has been restricted, but the liberties we have we do not exercise. As a political interest—I should say the major political interest of every citizen—civil liberties suffers the most cruel neglect. A hundred, not six, votes could be mobilized against HUAC if only a little political suasion could be applied.

With all this in mind, measure the relative paucity of protest against the powers of Juggernaut. The warfare interests do not need a lobby; if you have $50 billion to spend, what's the need of a lobby?* The major defense companies don't bother to maintain lobbies. Nevertheless, Juggernaut has its lobbies—dozens of them, the most potent in Washington. The Air Force, sole customer of many companies and industries, is a tax-supported lobby for these interests. Behind each of the services is a potent lobby: the Air Force Association, the Navy League, the Association of the Army, the Marine Corps League.

* The point is obvious but it requires constant emphasis. The way to insure large armament expenditures in 1962 is to spend a great deal on armaments in 1961. In other words, the scale and magnitude of arms spending in and of itself generates the pressure to keep the level of spending high. In effect, therefore, the lobby that supports the warfare state is self-generating, and self-perpetuating. The more we spend on arms, the greater becomes the pressure to keep on spending. Once the spigot is turned on, no one wants to see it turned off.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Pentagon spends $30 million annually on public relations and commands the prompt attention of the mass media at all times. And don't forget reserve officers associations, National Guard associations, the Legion, and a dozen or more associations such as the National Industrial Security Association, which represent an institutionalization of the relation between industry and the military. NISA was created by the late James Forrestal as long ago as 1944 in order, so this far-sighted industry spokesman said, to form a "selfless partnership" between Big Business and Big Brass. The amount spent on selling military hardware has never been estimated, but the total is very large. Count the pages of defense advertising in the magazine published by the Air Force Association and multiply by their page rate. The incumbent president of the American Rocket Society estimates that $100 million is spent annually—$50 million directly, $50 million indirectly—in setting up so-called "technical conferences"—they must not be called conventions—for the aerospace and related industries. And we should not forget the 350 or more so-called non-profit research associations such as the Rand Corporation that have been set up in the last decade; this year saw the incorporation of the first postwar research institute for peace.

But these lobbies—these pressures—do not constitute Juggernaut's real lobby. That lobby is us—the people. How can one measure the incessant pressure that communities have exerted on Congress, the executive, and the defense establishment throughout the postwar period to spend more on defense? Responding to these pressures, Congress gives the Pentagon more money than it has requested. Remove a dollar of Southern California's aerospace contracts and the pious caterwauling can be heard as far east as Hoboken. And don't forget: many Congressmen and Senators are reservists who constitute a lobby-beyond-price for the Pentagon, which shows its appreciation by flying socially congenial groups of Congressmen and Senators, and their ladies, on flights the cost of which the Pentagon is reluctant to disclose. Congressmen told James McCartney that they receive an average of three phone calls a day from constituents needling them about defense contracts; the Pentagon reports that it receives 500,000 phone calls a year from

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Congressmen on this same subject. This, then, is Juggernaut's real lobby and up to the present it has been unbeatable.

But more recently Juggernaut has begun to feel uneasy; maybe the lobby-of-the-people is beginning to be disaffected. There are signs of protest: one hears voices, sees pickets. The shelter protest was a portent. So now Juggernaut applies a new pressure—a pressure on the people in the form of the so-called radical Right. The stirring of this rally-on-the-Right is what has triggered the shouting we have heard all year. The rally is made up of all sorts: Texans and other ultras, bush-whackers, guerrillas, minutemen, mountainmen, Birchites, National Indignants, and Mothers for Armaments. This more or less affluent rabble is organized in perhaps a thousand groups, most of them spin-offs of a dozen or so key organizations, and it numbers perhaps eight or ten million. It is hard to count the Indignants, for they keep moving through the revolving doors that connect one front with another. Moreover they think alike and act alike: the voices, always loud, are interchangeable. Nice people, every last one of them. They want to starve the children UNICEF is trying to help. They propose to make Khrushchev say "uncle"—at no increase in taxes. They would close mental health clinics—they have personal reasons to fear these institutions. And, of course, they want to break up the UN. They are not *for* much but they are capable of affirmations; at the moment, for example, they are *for* Katanga.

Now it would be a mistake not to take this rally-on-the-Right seriously, just as it would be a mistake not to take Juggernaut seriously, for the rally is Juggernaut's auxiliary. At the same time it would be a tactical mistake not to point out some of the absurdities of the present situation and the openings and opportunities which it has created. Take, for example, the minutemen and mountainmen. I have great difficulty in distinguishing minutemen from mountainmen, although I was born a few miles from the Continental Divide in the Colorado Rockies and should know a mountainman when I see one. But recently the two images came into clear focus to these myopic eyes. Flushed into the open, one minuteman leader in California turned out to be a man with a long criminal record, which included arrest and conviction for indecent exposure. His op-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

posite number in the California mountainmen also turned up with a long criminal record, including arrest and conviction for molesting little children. Now the distinction here is not much—scarcely noticeable—still, indecent exposure is not the same thing as molesting little children. We laugh when we read that the mountainmen train on the Anza Desert, where they live on cactus wrens, roast coyote, baked alligator lizard, boiled hairless caterpillar—the hairy kind is poisonous—and drink mesquite-bean coffee. We laugh, too, when we learn that the organizer of the minutemen just happens to manufacture a plastic cover for the human body which will protect the wearer against toxic and nervous gases. It's called the Minute Mask and members can get it for "under $5." But Major General Roderic Hill, Adjutant General of the California National Guard, takes these groups seriously. He has observed their maneuvers. They exist, the General reports, in "some strength" and they have arms: submachine guns, Browning automatic rifles, 30 caliber light machine guns, and bazookas. Law-enforcement officials take them seriously also; the officials call attention, for example, to the vast stock of private arms that exists in the country today. And anyone who has observed how local Civil Defense groups, here and there, have begun to act like strong-arm squads, will want to take another look at the minutemen. So will those who have observed that White Citizens Council groups in the South are beginning to call themselves minutemen.

In much the same way, the Birchites and others who spread slander and poison the letter columns are also ludicrous—and potentially dangerous. In El Cajon, California, a newspaper editor satirized their local antics in some lines of doggerel:

> You cannot trust your neighbor
> Or even next of kin.
> If Mommy is a Commy,
> You've got to turn her in.

Nevertheless, the systematic destruction, fiber by fiber, of the fabric of confidence and trust and mutual respect which alone holds a community together is not a laughing matter.

Some indignant California rightists complain that "God Bless America" is not to be found in the music book used in the public schools, which contains, suspiciously, a tune called

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"The Shining Sickle Song." But it turns out that God Bless America, being copyrighted, could not be included; the composer knew a good thing when he saw one. A clear case, obviously, of the profit motive leading to the brink of sedition. And everyone was relieved to learn that the sickle song has never been on the Kremlin Hit Parade but is instead an American folk tune about the harvest which is sung at Thanksgiving. Amusing, yes. But this all-out attack from the Right on public education has an impact.

These groups that make up the rally-on-the-Right are not dangerous in themselves; they are dangerous because they constitute the political irregulars, the potential muscle, to keep Juggernaut's people's lobby from getting out of hand. They have money. They have organization. They have clearly traceable ties with the military. And they are beginning to draw together. True, they do not have a leader, but this is not fatal. And they do not have a program. But, tell me, what need does a thundering herd of runaway rhinoceroses have with a program? All that matters is that enough of them charge hard enough in the same direction at the same time.

Fortunately the same circumstances that have brought this rally into being also open up new opportunities for political action. The radical Right is dispelling the so-called "apathy" which has long prevailed. It poses a real threat to the conservatives and moderates in the Republican Party. It has aligned the three major religious groupings of the country against it. It has forged an Eisenhower-Kennedy axis—on this issue at least. Besides, the rally has a built-in weakness; it is anticlimactic. People can recognize this tawdry plot. It is spelled out for them in William Shirer's book, and any day's headlines carry reminders of a past that, fortunately, is still very much alive for many Americans.

But to preserve liberty, Juggernaut must be subdued. The struggle for civil rights, for civil liberties, for peace are one and the same struggle, and of these, the most neglected is civil liberties. What happens in the 1960's in this country depends on what we do as citizens. For this is pre-eminently the type of situation in which history engages the conscience of the individual citizen. The shelter issue brought us face-to-face with

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the reality of Juggernaut. What, now, do we propose to do about it? Why is there no peace lobby? Why does disarmament go begging as a political issue? Why is there no lobby for civil liberties? Listen to Mr. Gilpatric, the Deputy Defense Secretary: there are some pressures, he reports, on the other side; that is, against defense spending. But they come principally from the budget people, the Treasury Department, and, sometimes, from the business and financial community. "But this never translates," he reports, "into much support." So we know what needs to be done; the people's lobby that has supported Juggernaut must be offset with another kind of people's lobby, a lobby which stresses the priority of peace. Circumstances are more favorable to the formation of such a lobby than at any time in the postwar period. But the initiative must come from individuals. There is no force in politics at all capable of coping with the amazing initiative of the individual American citizen once he is aroused, once he sees a clear objective, once he decides to take action. Thomas M. Storke, editor and publisher of the *Santa Barbara News-Press,* winner of this year's Lauterbach Award for outstanding work in defense of civil liberties, drove the Birchites to cover in Santa Barbara. To be sure, he owns a newspaper and is a man of power and wealth; but it was his initiative and courage, not his power nor his wealth, that won this battle. Of course there are some risks involved; yet the exercise of civil liberties in a time of tension has always entailed a measure of inconvenience and risk and, now and then, of actual danger. But this has always been true.

You are familiar, of course, with Edward Albee's play "The Sandbox." Grandma is stretched out in the sandbox, the end is near. To one side a young man, the Angel of Death, is flexing his beautiful muscles. He tells Grandma he is from Southern California and she says: "it figgers, it figgers." Daddy and Mommy are afraid. They hear sounds in the night. Daddy thinks it is thunder or perhaps a wave or something. Mommy thinks it is a rumble "and you know what *that* means," she says. All the while, Grandma is very nice, buried almost to her

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

chin in the sand, very cooperative, very grateful. Everything is nice, dear, and thank you, dear. And so the curtain descends.

My point—it may not be Mr. Albee's—is simply this: it is time we got out of that sandbox. There are things to be done. There is work to do.

The defense effort has become an octopus, with economic tentacles threading into every crevice of the nation, with every level of society involved in the perpetuation of the cold war duel. No area of human endeavor is completely immune from its influence. The airplane and missile manufacturers, with 85 to 100 per cent of their business dependent on government contracts, cannot afford peace. Neither can the local businessman or the local Chamber of Commerce when the federal government abandons an installation that has outlived its usefuless in the missile age. Every time a warplane model is discontinued or a missile fails to make the grade and contracts are canceled, thousands of workers are thrown out of jobs and their unions howl that the federal government mustn't do *this* to *them*—to someone else, yes, but not to *them*. We are all bound up in an armament rat race in which ever-maintained international tension is an essential ingredient, in which ever-new weapons of ever-mounting horror are vital not just for our protection, but to insure the obsolescence that keeps the assembly lines going—a rat race with an almost inevitable terminal point in war's explosion and world destruction, but one we have not the self-discipline, the will or the vision to try to end.

—*Fred J. Cook, "The Juggernaut," The Nation, October* 28, 1961

You will say at once that the abolition of war has been the dream of man for centuries, every proposition to that end has been promptly discarded as impossible and fantastic. But that was before the science of the past decade made mass destruction a reality. The argument then was along spiritual and moral lines, and lost. But now the tremendous evolution of nuclear and other potentials of destruction has suddenly taken the problem away from its primary consideration as a moral and spiritual question and brought it abreast of scientific realism. It is no longer an ethical question to be pondered solely by learned philosophers and ecclesiastics, but a hard-core one for the decision of the masses whose survival is the issue.

—*General Douglas MacArthur, July* 5, 1961

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

REPORT FROM ECUADOR

BY MANUEL AGUSTIN AGUIRRE

Ecuador has been ruled for a long time by two fundamental oligarchical groups. One, centered in the Ecuadorian sierra is landowning, feudal, and economically backward; the other, based on the coast, is more developed economically owing to its connections with foreign import and export trade. The first group has constituted the principal nucleus of the Conservative Party which also has ramifications known as *Arnismo* and Social-Christianism. The second is somewhat more liberal in character.

It can be stated that what has been taking place in Ecuador is a conflict between oligarchical groups rather than a class struggle. The lack of industrial development has prevented the emergence of an industrial bourgeoisie which could oppose the feudal landlords. There exists only one dominant class of landowners, big merchants, and bankers whose factions continually dispute for control of the government, big business deals, and budgetary privileges.

These coastal and mountain elites have generally expressed themselves through two traditional parties: the Conservative and the Liberal. The former is closely allied to the Catholic Church and exploits by religious as well as economic means. The latter insincerely repeats the bourgeois trilogy "Liberty, Equality, Fraternity," impossible of realization in a semi-feudal, semi-colonial country. Both parties agree in maintaining indefinitely the archaic, backward socio-economic structure of the country. Both ceaselessly seek their own enrichment at the cost of hardships and misery to the Ecuadorian people. Both are tied to North American imperialism.

The awakening of the working masses who yearn for just and immediate improvements, the new ideological currents em-

---

Dr. Agustin Aguirre is Vice Rector of Central University, Quito.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

bodied in the parties of the Left which have appeared on the political scene, and the increasing loss of prestige of the Conservative and Liberal parties were all factors that forced the oligarchies, especially the more conservative one, to adopt a new strategy. This consisted of backing certain individuals who appear to be "independent" and "unaffiliated with any party" but who, because of origin, intellectual training, and unlimited ambition, can be helpful collaborators for the unchanging purpose of misdirecting and deceiving the people and of continuing to dominate and exploit them.

One of these key individuals is Dr. José María Velasco Ibarra, who, for about thirty years, with the exception of short intervals, has played the leading role assigned to him by the Ecuadorian elites. He brought to the part special qualifications: he was a man of conservative background but ambiguous ideology that permitted him to display, like a rainbow, a variety of colors. This political chameleon had, in addition, a talent for popular, facile, and flowing oratory which, combined with an absolute lack of scruples, enabled him to evolve a boundless demagogy and to delude the Ecuadorian people for many, many years.

It was the conservative landowning oligarchy from the sierra that first encouraged and financed Velasco Ibarra; later on, he also obtained the support of the commercial and financial elite of the coast. While he alternated in his efficient service to those who financed him generously with millions drawn from the sweat and blood of the workers, he hurled insults against "rascals and thieves," deceiving with big words and theatrical gestures the politically uneducated masses, who knew that they were the victims of the rascals and thieves but not that these enemies were hiding behind the gestures and words of their supposed redeemer.

Velasco even formed his own elite, giving free rein to his closest adherents. He placed these associates in important posts thus creating a new layer of rich men who constituted his financial reserve. Through a strategy of refined hypocrisy, he did not fill his own pockets as others do, since he wanted to appear "honest and incorruptible." Instead, he put millions into the pockets of his intimate friends who then financed his ostenta-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tious and noisy presidential campaigns. It is hard to find in Latin America a more clamorous and successful case of sham.

In the million-dollar campaign that brought him to power for the fourth time in 1960, he over-did himself as never before in demagogic promises. From his words flowed rivers of milk and honey that were to stream endlessly through the country. Nevertheless, on taking office his first decrees raised indirect taxation that most affected consumers, and enacted legal and monetary reforms which favored the groups wanting to recover their electoral investments. All this was crowned by Decree Number 33, which imposed a monetary devaluation. This meant and still means—for the new government has done nothing to change the situation in this respect—greater privileges for the privileged and greater poverty for the working people of Ecuador.

As a result, the Workers Confederation of Ecuador (CTE) called a national general strike to demand that Congress repeal these emergency laws. The strike was supported by the students and the majority of the people, including *velasquistas* disillusioned by the demagogy of the government. The government answered with mounted police and machine-gun fire. Some workers and students were killed. As more victims fell, mainly high school and university students, the people became incensed.

Velasco made an attempt, with the support of the Army, to proclaim himself dictator. He had done it on other occasions, notably, on March 30th, 1946, when he overthrew the progressive Constitution passed by the Constitutional Assembly of 1944-1945. Nevertheless, this last and most recent bid for absolute power failed and the demagogue was deposed. However, he imprisoned his successor, the Vice President and presiding officer of Congress, Dr. Carlos Julio Arosemena Monroy. Despite this, Arosemena was proclaimed President of the Republic by Congress and finally took office after the withdrawal of Dr. Camilo Gallegos Toledo, head of the Supreme Court, who had been offered the Presidency at the same time by part of the Army.

A few words about the new executive, Dr. Arosemena. He comes from an old established banking family of the coastal city of Guayaquil. His political career began and developed

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

under the wing of Dr. Velasco Ibarra. He directed the latter's last political campaigns and was his running mate in the most recent election which took place June 5th, 1960. During the first months of Dr. Velasco's fourth term, while the latter inundated the country, as usual, with a flood of oratory, Vice President Arosemena was generally silent, avoiding participation in certain official functions. This provoked comments about the estrangement of the two rulers. The discord was accentuated later, when an open quarrel began between a sector of Congress—presided over by Dr. Arosemena—and the chief executive, Dr. Velasco.

An important incident in the persistent differences between Arosemena and Velasco was Arosemena's decision to accept an invitation to visit the Soviet Union. The trip was made against the will of the Council of Ministers which, Arosemena declared, made its objection after he had accepted the invitation. The trip evoked sympathy towards him on the Left despite the fact that on his return from the USSR he said hardly a word about that country. Undoubtedly, this new support helped him get to power through the cruel struggle mentioned above, fought mainly by the Workers Confederation (CTE), the Federation of University Students (FEUE), and the Left political parties.

The new President began by organizing a Cabinet of National Unity that includes representatives of the most reactionary forces of the Right as well as men vaguely identified with the Left. The CTE, the FEUE, and the radical parties (Revolutionary Socialist and Communist) have given the government conditional support, expecting a solid program of popular reform.

The new government of national unity, made up of opposing and contradictory forces, lacks a definite administrative policy. In the near future it will have to define itself by adopting a position to the Right or in the Center or—less probably—of advance to the Left. In the meantime, the government has promised, among other things, agrarian reform. This reform was demanded by a mass meeting of over 20,000 Indian peasants before whom Arosemena promised the abolition of feudal and semi-feudal conditions and fiscal reforms to reduce the indirect taxation that strangles the consuming public and

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to establish direct measures to tax those who own the country's wealth. In international affairs, the government has spoken for relations with the United States as well as with the USSR, but has done nothing toward the establishment of relations with the latter country. It has also promised to observe the principles of non-intervention and self-determination, but has kept in the foreign ministry a reactionary who is an enemy of the Cuban Revolution.

Actually, as President Arosemena himself has declared, no revolution has taken place here, certainly none in the true sense of the word. What has occurred is an official split, perhaps only a turn of the coin. It seems certain that, as on other occasions, the bloodshed by the people will have been in vain, that there will be a continuation of rule by the dominant oligarchies that alternate in power.

But the working class of the country is acquiring a clear understanding of the present situation and of its destiny. Backed by the peasants and other progressive forces, it will yet make its REVOLUTION, a revolution in capital letters, a socialist revolution like Cuba's, the only revolution that will really liberate the oppressed peoples of Latin America and of the world.

We don't owe Latin America any kind of Marshall Plan, but if anything drastic is accomplished by the Alliance for Progress we now offer, the man to be thanked is Fidel Castro. Without dramatization of a Communist threat, it is arguable that Washington might well have continued dillydallying. If the alliance succeeds it should perhaps be marked by statues respectively honoring Kennedy and Castro. The mere reiteration of platitudes like the need for a good-neighbor policy would not have accomplished the needed reveille.

—C. L. Sulzberger, New York Times, December 18, 1961

You said it, kid.

There are only two kinds of war in history, just and unjust. We support just wars and oppose unjust wars. All counter-revolutionary wars are unjust, and all revolutionary wars are just.

—Mao Tse-Tung

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

SOCIALISM AND DEMOCRACY

BY CHEDDI JAGAN

This is the complete text of the address which Dr. Cheddi Jagan, Premier of British Guiana, delivered to the National Press Club in Washington on October 24, 1961. In it, Dr. Jagan in effect challenges the United States ruling class to choose between providing aid to an outspokenly socialist regime in an underdeveloped country or exposing its protestations of devotion to democracy as sham and hypocrisy.—The Editors.

I am told that I am a controversial figure. I think therefore that my first duty today is to put my personal position before you as briefly and clearly as I can.

I am, I believe, generally dismissed in this country as a Communist. That word has a variety of meanings according to the personal views of the man who makes the charge. Some people, for example, said that General Eisenhower was a Communist. To others a Communist means simply a person who is in favor of a certain pattern of economic organization in which the state plays a certain and active part. Still others mean when they call you a Communist that you are a dedicated agent of what they call an "international conspiracy." During your own struggle to get rid of colonialism your leaders were called all sorts of names. For example, if the term had been known in his day, General Lafayette would almost certainly have been called a Communist. Tom Paine, whose writings fired the blood of your revolutionaries and inspired me during my student days here, was charged with seditious libel for publishing the "Rights of Man." An ex-colonial American Chief Justice, John Reeves, set up an organization in England called the Society for the Preservation of Liberty and Property against Republicans and Levellers. And the leaders of your revolution were charged with conspiring with a foreign power—Jacobin France. I draw attention to these aspects of your history because I think it will help you to understand why I have so often been called names and had my views misrepresented and distorted. Let me now tell you where I stand.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

First of all I am a passionate anti-colonialist. I, like your forefathers, believe that colonialism is wicked. I believe so strongly that colonialism is utterly wrong that I would gladly accept any help from whatever quarter to help me in my fight against it.

My country is about the size of Great Britain or the State of Minnesota. It is a poor country, but it has considerable unused resources and great possibilities for development. At the moment, most of its half a million people barely eke out a living on a narrow low-lying coastal strip of land which accounts for only four percent of our land area. Although the country is mainly agricultural, we still have to import many agricultural products. This is not the only paradox in our situation. In a country so largely unoccupied, there is also grave land hunger, for it takes great sums of money to reclaim and then protect cultivable land from floods, the sea, and the jungle, and we have never been able to afford enough of these works.

There is almost no industry. My country depends on three or four main products—sugar, bauxite, rice, and timber—the exploitation of two of which is in the hands of foreign companies. Indeed these two industries, sugar and bauxite, between them account for 75 percent of the exports of the country.

British Guiana today in fact presents the typical pattern of a colonial economy. It is little more than a raw material base and a market for industrial products, with the drain of wealth abroad which perforce results.

I am dedicated to the task of changing this pattern. I wish to see my country prosperous and developing, its people happy, well-fed, well-housed, and with jobs to do. Too many of them at the present time lack these elementary essentials. Second only to my passion for the independence of my people is this dedication to their economic advancement, so that their lives may be more abundant. Now, in this, I am a socialist. By this I mean that I am in favor of the workers reaping the full fruits of their labor through public ownership of the means of production, distribution, and exchange. I believe that it is only by planning on this basis and with a scientific assessment of our situation that I can rapidly modernize our economy and pro-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

vide my people with the higher standards of living they want and have a right to expect.

I believe ideally in the nationalization of all the important means of production, distribution, and exchange. This will ensure a fairer distribution of a country's wealth than any other system. But I also have to recognize things as they are. While I reserve our right, as any sovereign nation does, to nationalize whatever industry we think should be nationalized in the public interest, we have explicitly stated that we have no intention of nationalizing the existing sugar and bauxite companies. These companies today dominate our economy, but British Guiana is still largely underdeveloped. We are resolved to diversify our economy and to industrialize it rapidly so that as we launch new enterprises the proportion of our national income produced by expatriate enterprise becomes smaller and its present command of our economic life weakened. If on the other hand it ever became necessary to nationalize any industries, fair and adequate compensation would be paid.

In carrying out our program of industrialization the state will play an active and direct part. In this, our policy is, I believe, similar in aims to those followed by many other countries of the world, such as India, Ghana, Yugoslavia, and Israel, all of which have received generous aid from America.

I place myself in company with other nationalist leaders of Asia and Africa. I believe, like these nationalist leaders, that the economic theories of scientific socialism hold out the promise of a dynamic and social discipline which can transform an underdeveloped country into a developed one in a far shorter time than any other system.

We may differ from you on the way we organize our economic life. You have as your dominant philosophy private enterprise, but let us not forget that your development took place in a different historical epoch when conditions—economic and technological—were not as they are today. It is, however, generally agreed now that in an underdeveloped country and in the face of the rising expectations of the people the state must play a more pervasive role. But we certainly do not differ from you in our political objective, which is the establishment and maintenance of a democratic way of life.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

I have won my place in the political life of my country in three successive general elections. I have not come to power by revolution or coup d'etat. I believe in parliamentary democracy, by which I recognize the rights of opposition parties, freedom of speech, freedom of worship, regular and honest elections, an impartial judiciary, and an independent civil service. I have been accused of plotting the destruction of freedom in my country. The truth is that those who accuse me of this have themselves been responsible for the denial of freedom to the broad masses of our people. I have struggled for these freedoms and it was I who first proposed that a Bill of Rights guaranteeing every citizen his fundamental rights, including the right to hold property, buttressed by an appeal to the courts, be entrenched in the new constitution of British Guiana. It was I who saw to it that these provisions, which are unique in the region and which are not part of the British parliamentary tradition but which are based on your own constitution, were inserted in our new British Guiana constitution. I intend that the same rights shall be similarly entrenched in the constitution of an independent Guiana.

To carry out the program of social and economic reform I have in mind for my country I need both trade and aid. I have already pointed out the need for large-scale industrialization if there is to be an improvement in the living standards of the Guianese people. Because of the small population and limited home market, a program for industrialization must be tied to export markets previously explored and secured. It is obligatory on us, therefore, to make trade agreements either on a government level or with privately-owned agencies wherever we can find markets.

Finally, may I touch briefly on the place we hope to take in the world when our independence is achieved shortly. I mean to pursue a policy of active neutralism. Because of the immensity of our problems, I am forced, like India and some other underdeveloped countries, to seek aid from all possible sources. I have, however, made no secret of the fact that I will not accept any aid upon conditions which limit the sovereignty of my people. We do not intend to be a bridgehead or a base for anyone. I am concerned only with the urgent prob-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

lems of the social and economic development of my country. I am not interested in the Cold War, in which in any case my small country can play no effective role. Sensational headline writers sometimes lose their sense of proportion when they forget this.

That is not to say that I will not interest myself in the many problems of our 20th-century world, some of which are bound to affect us. We look forward indeed in due course to taking our place in the United Nations which represents, particularly for small nations, their guarantee of independence and their hope for the future. We will look at all the world issues, each in turn, and will make up our minds on the evidence presented to us without committing ourselves in advance to any side. I have sometimes been asked where I stand on particular world issues. To this my reply is that a foreign policy is not developed in a vacuum. We are not yet independent. We have no foreign policy at the moment or the diplomatic resources on which sound judgments can be based. At this stage I cannot answer such hypothetical questions. I can only give you the principles which will guide me. I do feel that my country can, in our contemporary world of blocs and groups, play a part in bringing about a better understanding among nations. In a sense we should not be unqualified to do so. We are a small people of mainly Afro-Asian descent. We are situated in Latin America, but we speak the English language and have strong ties with North America and the British Commonwealth.

In a recent speech Professor Rostow described American policy thus:

> We are dedicated to the proposition that this revolutionary process of modernization shall be permitted to go forward in independence with increasing degrees of human freedoms. We seek two results: first that truly independent nations shall emerge on the world scene; and second that each nation shall be permitted to fashion, out of its own culture and its own ambitions, the kind of modern society it wants.

That is also my ambition for my country.

In a sense our visit to this country, our request to you for aid, is a test of basic principles. The government of the United

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

States has stated clearly that their concern is to foster and preserve democracy, that the internal affairs of democratic countries are their own concern. What then happens when a people, by an admittedly genuine popular vote, opt for a socialist economic system? Will the United States respect this decision? Will she give aid and succor to preserve that democracy? Or will she withhold her aid at the very real risk of that democracy being overthrown by a dictatorial uprising based on the people's poverty? Will the United States government give in to pressure groups that exist within it as within all governments and so act as to preserve capitalism by sacrificing the democracy it has so long championed?

There are not lacking, even within this country itself, writers, thinkers, scholars, who hold that when the government of the United States uses the word "democracy" they really mean capitalism. If these men are right, then we can expect no help, for while we are an admittedly genuine democracy we are also admittedly socialist.

Sooner or later this issue had to be squarely faced and clarified by your administration. History has chosen my own small country to be the focus of this problem. The decision must now be made and demonstrably made.

Indeed, gentlemen, it is not our concept of democracy which is now on trial, but yours.

MR PRESS **PAPERBACKS**

CAPITALISM YESTERDAY AND TODAY
by Maurice Dobb (flexible cloth binding) $1.00

THE ALIENATION OF MODERN MAN
by Fritz Pappenheim 1.25

AMERICAN RADICALS: SOME PROBLEMS AND PERSONALITIES
Harvey Goldberg, editor 1.25

AMERICAN LABOR IN MIDPASSAGE
Bert Cochran, editor 1.25

MAN'S WORLDLY GOODS
by Leo Huberman 1.75

CUBA: ANATOMY OF A REVOLUTION
by Leo Huberman and Paul M. Sweezy 1.75

THE PRESENT AS HISTORY (flexible cloth binding)
by Paul M. Sweezy List $2.95; special price 2.00

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

WORLD EVENTS

By Scott Nearing

"Castro's Days Are Numbered"

"Castro's days as Communist dictator of Cuba would appear to be numbered. Castro cannot be permitted by U.S. to build Cuba into a big base for export of Communism through Latin America." (*U.S. News & World Report,* December 18, 1961)

After the Castro regime made clear its determination to organize and administer a socialist Cuba for the benefit of Cubans, it was only a question of time before land and other resources were taken over, basic units of the economy expropriated, and profiteering and corruption eliminated, as the Cuban people passed through the drastic processes of a social revolution.

The decision to socialize Cuba, coupled with the shift of Cuba's major international, economic, and political relations from the West to the East, created a tense anomaly in the whole of Latin America. Except in Cuba and Santo Domingo, all Latin American governments had been tied tight to the State Department. Latin American peoples, on the other hand, were excited and thrilled by Castro's successes. So strong was this feeling that throughout 1961 Washington dared not move directly against Castro. Instead, its CIA launched a preposterous cloak-and-dagger movement among the anti-Castro elements in Miami and New York. The movement, begun under Eisenhower and taken over by Kennedy, led up to the disastrous invasion fiasco of April 17, 1961.

This episode added the sting of humiliating military defeat to the heavy economic losses suffered by United States sugar, oil, and utility interests and the diplomatic defeats suffered by the Washington government during its long interchange with Havana.

As Cuban-United States relations worsened, relations between Cuba and the Soviet bloc improved. At long last, after the petering out of the Mexican Revolution and the crushing

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of the progressive regime in Guatemala, the island of Cuba had given birth to an authentic social revolution which showed every sign of providing the Marxist-Leninist forces with a foothold in the Western Hemisphere.

This development led the United States oligarchy to shoulder four tasks: (1) To tighten its alliance with the oligarchies which rule Latin America; (2) to see that the Latin American people had their share of bread, beer, and circuses; (3) to wipe out the organized Latin American Left; and (4) to do this job "legally" under OAS auspices.

The Alliance for Capitalist Progress in Latin America; the drive to isolate Cuba, starve its economy, and discredit its government; and the preparations for a second invasion (sponsored by the CIA and manned by anti-Castro Cubans and mercenaries supplied by anti-Castro Latin American governments) all fit into this pattern.

Last evening we met a United States newsman who had just returned from a three-month tour of duty in Cuba. His first question was: "Does the Washington government really intend to invade Cuba again?" He added, "The Cubans generally expect another invasion." Since we have heard this question asked time after time during the past few weeks we feel sure that some MR readers will be interested in our considered answer.

Building Fortress America

Democratic President Kennedy and his advisers have set out to do what Republican President Hoover talked about many years ago. Hoover favored less emphasis on aid to Europe and Asia and more attention to the integration of the Americas. History teaches one unmistakable lesson: world power will be no stronger than the nucleus around which it is built. Egyptian empires were built around the Nile Valley. Rome built its first nucleus in Latinum, then enlarged its base to include most of Italy. England first consolidated the British Isles, then expanded its empire from that power center. In an electric-atomic era a power base will be continent-wide at the very least.

There are two continents in the Western Hemisphere. The line which divides them runs along the U.S.-Mexico border.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

North of this line is the industrialized, mechanized, coordinated U.S.-Canada complex. South of the Mexican border lies an immense reserve of natural resources, peopled by one hundred sixty millions who are just emerging from a semi-feudal landlord-army-church-dominated rural economy, and forty million people who occupy some of the fastest growing commercial-industrial urban centers to be found anywhere on the planet.

United States-Canadian modernization took place largely between 1860 and 1960. Modernization of Latin America has been concentrated in the period since 1900. Much of it has taken place since the onset of World War II.

World war fought in Europe-Africa-Asia played a decisive role in the Americas. It drew heavily on North American resources while greatly expanding its world market. It created an enormous demand for Latin America's food, metals, minerals. It forced Latin Americans to produce their own manufactured consumer goods and provided them with the funds necessary to begin extensive industrialization. The shift of Latin America's economic base from agriculture to commerce, industry, and finance, by comparison with Europe and North America, began very late in the day. Once begun, however, it is proceeding with giant strides, assisted by European and North American know-how and capital, and greatly expedited by foreign experience.

North America is a modernized, integrated complex based on commerce, industry, and finance, and generously supplied with food and agricultural raw materials. Latin America is being rapidly transformed from an agricultural to a commerce-industry-finance base. North America, broadly speaking, is stabilized as a major capitalist-imperialist power. Latin America is passing through the stages of bourgeois revolution.

Economically, Latin American foods and raw materials provide the handiest source of supply for the expanding US-Canadian economy. Latin American markets for manufactures must be won and held against the strenuous, low-cost competition of equal quality wares from Europe and Asia.

This is the economic background against which North American big business and big government are trying to build and integrate Fortress America. If this task of integration can

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

be done fast enough and thoroughly enough (under United States leadership) the base thus established may be sufficiently solid and enduring to provide the foundation for a planet-girdling American Empire and thus to inaugurate an American Century that will outpoint the British Century which spanned the hundred years from 1815 to 1914.

Four Major Tasks

Four major tasks confronted President Kennedy and his Big-Business big-military big-labor middle-class backers as they took over the blundering Eisenhower campaign to expand the economy and paralyze the revolutionary Left. The first task was to keep Latin America under the economic heel and the political thumb of United States-Canada. The second task was to blunt the edge of foreign economic competition, especially the competition of a Europe united under German leadership, and of Japan. The third task was to hold the line against any further geographical expansion of Communism, and more especially any expansion into the Western Hemisphere. The fourth task was to organize a movement, preferably under OAS auspices, that will sweep the Western Hemisphere clear of Communist ideas and Communist institutions from Cape Horn to the Arctic Circle.

At the same time the Kennedy administration must launch a crusade, led by NATO and based on Germany in Europe and Japan in Asia, to invade and occupy those areas of Europe and Asia where attempts are being made to build a socialist-communist social pattern.

Alliance for Capitalist Progress

Fourteen years ago a drive was initiated by the United States Secretary of State to rehabilitate and restore the shattered structure of European capitalism. Contemporary usage named the project the "Marshall Plan." It would have been more specific to call it Alliance for Salvaging European Capitalism.

Those were dark days in Central and Western Europe. The continent was suffering from prodigious war damage to property and life, from the power vacuum left by the unconditional surrender of the Nazi-led Central European bloc, from the loss of faith and hope among the war-weary millions,

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

from disunity among the Allies, from revolt in the colonies, from the East European move toward the Soviet Union, or from victorious Soviet armies encamped in Berlin within striking distance of the English Channel. The West was at bay along a sagging front threatened by a crushing blow from abroad and subversion at home. Inside and outside the European nations that had ruled the world before 1918 there were many informed persons who shook their heads and said, "The jig is up."

At this critical juncture in the life of capitalist imperialism the United States again took the center of the European stage. United States productivity, capital, and armed forces played a title role in shaping the outcome of two Europe-centered, planet-wide wars. Now the stage was set for Washington to play the title role of savior to a tattered capitalist Europe and thus, indirectly, to the capitalist world.

Under United States leadership, financed by billions of United States dollars, shielded by United States land, sea, and air forces against a military attack from the East, the bankrupt shell of 19th-century European capitalism was fitted out with temporary handouts in the form of consumer goods and working capital and more permanent aid for the replacement of its capital plant and the equipment of its armed forces with the most recent types of military hardware.

Having made this decisive contribution to the restoration of European capitalism during the Truman-Eisenhower era, the United States oligarchy is using the Kennedy administration to put its own household (the Western Hemisphere) in order.

The first decisive step in this direction is a clean-up job in Latin America. The vast spaces and the immense resources south of the Rio Grande are indispensable for the rejuvenation of world capitalism. At the same time political fragmentation, social backwardness, and unrest, and the clashing interests of a score of rival nationalisms hamper the effective utilization of these possibilities. If world capitalism is to win its battle against the swift advances of socialist construction, Latin America may play a decisive role in the outcome. Therefore the emergence of the Alliance for Latin American Progress, which in reality is to be Latin America's vital contribution to the rehabilitation of world capitalism.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"China Must Not Enter"

Since the United Nations Charter was written, in 1945, the United States has played a dominant role in the one-nation-one-vote General Assembly. The technique? Simplicity itself. On decisive issues Washington has been able to supplement its own voice with twenty Latin American votes. No other nation has had such a head start in influencing UN policy.

Year after year Washington's voting strength in the Assembly has been tested early in each session by introducing a resolution: Resolved that the question of admitting People's China to the United Nations shall not be discussed at this session of the Assembly. Until 1961 this strategy proved effective. China has been represented by a defeated faction (driven from the mainland during the Chinese Civil War), while the 700 million inhabitants of the mainland have been without representation, voice, or vote in the UN.

The object of this maneuver was obvious—to keep down the voting strength of the Soviet bloc in the UN. By 1961, however, the practice had worn so thin that it could not be pushed through the Assembly. A Soviet-sponsored resolution calling for the recognition of the Peking government as the legitimate representative of the Chinese people was debated for two weeks in the Assembly. On December 15th, with 48 votes against to 37 for, and 19 abstentions, the Soviet resolution was defeated. Every Latin American delegation in the Assembly (except Cuba's) voted against the admission of People's China.

Richard Eder, reporting in the *New York Times* (December 16) wrote: "Only vigorous campaigning and considerable pressure won for the United States. The Latin American bloc, with the exception of Cuba, held firm. . . . Earlier, Brazil and one or two others had indicated that they were wavering in their support of the American position."

After this success Washington can continue with its preparations for the long-delayed meeting of OAS prime ministers which will be called together in January for the express purpose of dealing with Castro's Cuba.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

In the latest MR PRESS *pamphlet*

PROBLEMS OF DISARMAMENT

these authors	*discuss*	*these subjects*
Hans A. Bethe		*The Test Ban Negotiations*
Douglas F. Dowd		*Economics of Disarmament*
Mario Einaudi		*The U.S. and Soviet Positions*
Walter F. LaFeber		*Disarmament, 1945-1961*
Philip Morrison		*Can We Find A Way?*
Jay Orear		*The Meaning of Pugwash*

From the Publisher's Note:

The articles which appear in this pamphlet were first published as a special supplement to *The Cornell Daily Sun* of October 26, 1961. We are reprinting them in this form, by agreement with *The Sun* and the authors, because we believe that the views of six distinguished members of the faculty of one of our leading universities on what is perhaps the most fateful issue of our time deserve to be circulated far beyond the confines of the university community to which they belong.

Single copy 35 cents

3 copies for $1.00 20 copies for $5.00

You will want your friends to read this pamphlet, so why not order at least 3 today?

Send your order, with payment enclosed, to

Monthly Review Press 333 Sixth Ave. New York 14, N. Y.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Books

With this issue of MR, we initiate a new feature under the heading "Books." The section will run whenever we have enough material on hand to warrant it.

This is not intended to be an ordinary book review section. As we see it now, it will consist mostly of articles which deal with or are inspired by a small number of books which for one reason or another can be considered to be important in the fields of social science and social thought. It will also include articles, like Mr. Stevenson's on Hemingway below, which deal with the social aspects of literature and the arts. Later on, we may add lists of books or perhaps short descriptive notices to bring significant new publications to the attention of MR readers.

Our approach to this new feature is still experimental. We will welcome comments and suggestions from readers for improving it, or even completely re-shaping it. We will also welcome suggestions as to which books deserve to be the subject of reviews and the names of particularly well qualified reviewers. To our academic friends, as well as to those in governmental or international agencies, we would like to make it clear that we understand that anonymity is often necessary: it always has been and is more than ever under present-day conditions. Don't let the fact that you or some one you know cannot sign a review keep you from volunteering or suggesting a name. That anonymity doesn't necessarily impair the usefulness of reviews is shown, for example, by the Times Literary Supplement *of London in which all reviews are anonymous.*

—THE EDITORS

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

A NOTE ON ERNEST HEMINGWAY

BY PHILIP STEVENSON

In acknowledging Ernest Hemingway as one of the major talents of our time we need not go so far as John O'Hara who called him "the outstanding author since the death of Shakespeare"; nor need we belittle him with one of his own understatements: "He was pretty good in there."

Hemingway was a death-bedevilled man. Violence fascinated him. His favored recreations were the refined slaughter of the bullring, the safari, and the trout stream. In his writing, the concern of a surprising number of his characters was with the problem not of living well but of dying well.

What is it that happens to a young man of Hemingway's promise that leaves him more preoccupied with death than life? In his case, as for so many of his "lost generation," the catalyst was war. War was the supreme hypocrisy — supreme evil touted as supreme good. As patriotism. As glory. It summed up everything unacceptable in our way of life. Hemingway was only nineteen when he was severely wounded. From that wound he recovered; from the wound to his sensibilities it is doubtful that he ever recovered. In rejecting war he rejected the whole way of life that required and honored war—rejected it totally and irrevocably.

Death becomes more important than life when a man feels that the salt has been leached out of the earth and life has lost its savor. Then it becomes a trial to be endured, a test of courage. "I believed," Hemingway wrote later, "that life was a tragedy and knew it could have only one end." If a man is to keep his self-respect, he must face that end with dignity and integrity, accept defeat with resignation or go down fighting like a champ.

Consider some of the Hemingway heroes and their fate. The matadors of *Death in the Afternoon,* who embroider with technical brilliance their inevitable end. The aged bullfighter of *The Undefeated,* who can't quit the only profession he knows and goes to certain defeat bravely, his eyes open. The leading character of *The Snows of Kilimanjaro,* whose life is unfulfilled, and who, like Keats, is "half in love with easeful death"

Playwright, screen writer, and novelist, Philip Stevenson is at work on a fiction trilogy. Under the pseudonym of Lars Lawrence, Part I in two volumes, *Morning Noon and Night* and *Out of the Dust,* has already appeared. Part II is due out shortly.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

—a death symbolized by the high white purity of the tallest peak in Africa.

Then there is the Indian husband in the story called *Indian Camp,* who witnesses the protracted agony of his wife in childbirth—an ordeal so unendurable that when at last the child is delivered, by Caesarian section with a pocket-knife and no anaesthesia, the father is discovered to have cut his own throat. The most extreme example of this pattern—man courageously embracing defeat or death instead of fighting for life—occurs in one of Hemingway's most famous stories, *The Killers.* In that one, a gangster who has doublecrossed his pals goes to bed and tamely waits for them to come and rub him out. To a suggestion that the police be notified he replies, "That wouldn't do any good. . . . There ain't anything to do." This denial of hope reappears in *A Pursuit Race,* when a dope addict, informed that there is a cure, rejects it, saying, "They haven't got a cure for anything."

This kind of hopelessness seems a magnified echo of Hemingway's own disbelief in any cure for social ills. In much of his work he resembles one of his characters, the old waiter of *A Clean, Well-Lighted Place,* who not only believes in nothing but has made a creed and a prayer of the Spanish word for nothing—*nada*:

> Our nada who art in nada, nada be thy name, thy kingdom nada, thy will be nada, in nada as it is in nada. . . . Hail nothing, full of nothing, nothing is with thee . . .

and so on, ending with:

> "What's yours?" asked the bartender.
> "Nada."

It was this almost voluptuous nihilism that caused me to write, as long ago as 1938, that Hemingway's heroes, however courageous, seemed to be mostly capons. In *The Sun Also Rises* the leading character has literally suffered sexual damage in the war; in other works the symbolism is not so obvious, but again and again he is drawn to write of men impotent to deal adequately with life, doomed to exercise their courage in defeat and death. This pattern is Hemingway's legacy from the war.

I don't mean to overstate the nihilism in Hemingway's work. He was not only an artist of great sensitivity and strict integrity, he was also an extremely complex personality, whose actions often contradicted his philosophy. Basically an individualist, a believer in Man Alone, there was a considerable period during which he was saying, with Donne, that "No man is an Iland, intire of itselfe"—and backing up the words with deeds.

It began with the groping, unsatisfactory novel, *To Have and Have Not,* the hero of which spent a whole lifetime learning that in our society, "A man alone ain't got no bloody chance." Then came the crisis

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in his beloved Spain when a legally elected democratic government, passionately supported by the common people, was violently overthrown by Italian and German fascism. If any war was ever justifiable, ever truly defensive of human values and aspirations, this was it; and we remember with gratitude Hemingway's tireless labors on behalf of the Republic. It is to his everlasting credit that in order to do what he felt he must do to retain his integrity as a man and as an artist, he jettisoned his total rejection of social struggle and abandoned his individualism in favor of a collective cause.

To be sure, the conversion was not permanent. Hemingway was never able to "go the distance" (to borrow his phrase from the prize ring) with socialism. Once the Spanish Civil War was lost, he reverted to his belief that life was inevitable tragedy, defeat, and death. While writing his impressive novel, *For Whom the Bell Tolls,* he was no longer quite sure about the purity of the cause or the reasons for its defeat, and his hero remained a stubborn individualist and skeptic to the end. The remarkable thing is not that his sense of social responsibility waned after the heartbreaking surrender, nor that he tended to reassume the role of Man Alone—for many good people lost heart in those terrible days—but that he tried so hard and came so close to winning the battle within himself to transform the philosophical principles that had guided him all his life.

For Whom the Bell Tolls was attacked by the Left—sometimes crudely—for its confusions and infidelities. These critical strictures served to accelerate his return to loneliness—a loneliness so utter that he nearly stopped communicating altogether. Most of what he has written since then, including the novel he referred to as "the big one," has not been presented for publication. Presumably it did not satisfy him. As for his only published novel of this period, *Across the River and into the Trees,* it is by general agreement the poorest of his works.

Still, the bright stain of collective heroism in the siege of Madrid remained indelible. That his heart was still with the people, the Have-Nots of the world, ought to be clear to all. Only a few months before his death he lent the international prestige of his name in support of the Cuban Revolution and was photographed raising a toast to Fidel Castro—a pose *not* included in the pictorial biographies that briskly followed the shotgun blast in Idaho.

If Hemingway could never quite swallow socialism, neither could he swallow the Big Lie that pronounces dog-eat-dog to be the best, the only acceptable, the eternal way of life. In story after story he had exposed the hollow hypocrisy of the success legend. And he did not stop exposing it even after he became in himself the success story incarnate, knee-deep in honors

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and perquisites conferred on him by the arbiters of a way of life he had long ago rejected.

It is significant that his last first-rate story, *The Old Man and the Sea,* concerned precisely the success legend. An old fisherman, a small entrepreneur, Man Alone, has dreamed all his life of one day making the Big Killing. He is a man of patience and tenacity, courage, skill, and self-reliance. In his old age he succeeds. He hooks the Big Fish. The legend has apparently come true. Then, bit by bit, victory dwindles into defeat as rapacious sharks nibble away at the flesh of the fish till nothing but the colossal skeleton is left to mock the old man's dream.

Such is the reality that underlies the success legend. It is a very fishy fish-story. The truth is that although Man Alone may produce fabulous wealth by his toil, it is stolen from him by the sharks of our competitive society. The effect of the story is like the cry of a little boy who finds himself in a rigged and crooked game: "It's a darn ole big gyp!"

Hemingway is widely considered to be a writer of tragedy. He so considered himself. It seems to me this is seldom true, though so much of his work is ironic, pathetic, cynical, despairing, occasionally satiric. At least once, however, he achieved tragedy on the grand scale, in *A Farewell to Arms.* In this magnificent book, war is experienced as a demoralized rout, a vast and shattering defeat that carries down with it all positive human values and transforms the glory of love into the agony of loss. Here human beings do not merely face death bravely; they struggle for life, for fulfillment; and they create moments of beauty and happiness in opposition to the catastrophe that overwhelms them. In this context the desertion of the hero at the end is an act of positive rebellion. If he had written nothing else, *A Farewell to Arms* would, I believe, secure for Hemingway his place in the enduring literature of humanism.

Hemingway's style has influenced a whole generation of writing both here and abroad. His greatest achievement, it has been evaluated by top critics in many lands, and I have nothing to add to their paeans of praise. Here I want only to consider the question why Hemingway's writing occasionally gives the impression of parodying itself. One surely cannot quarrel with his aversion to the gaudy cliches commonly employed for making palatable the horrors and hypocrisies of our way of life, or with his predilection for the precise monosyllable in the lean and vigorous sentence. At its best, his prose ranks right up there alongside that of the literary stylists of the past. And yet, surprisingly often, his insistence on understatement gives to his writing a precious, self-conscious, simplistic character that pushes art into artifice, individuality into idiosyncrasy. Why?

I am not at all sure I have

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the answer. But I would hazard a guess that this tendency to self-parody is a reflection of the artificiality of much of Hemingway's content. Big-game hunting, deep-sea fishing, bullfighting—these are all artificially created competitive situations involving adventure and danger: artificial tests of character inapplicable to real-life conditions. Like all artificial social situations, these are hedged about with arbitrary obligations and prohibitions promoting good form and good manners. In his stories of hunting, fishing, and bullfighting, Hemingway never tires of explaining these subtleties. In *The Short Happy Life of Francis Macomber,* for instance, we learn that certain techniques, certain kinds of behavior, are "bad form" or "won't do" or "just aren't done" —a punctilio in the art of killing that strikes us as absurd if not despicable. This misplaced fastidiousness is frequently echoed in his prose, and when pushed to extremes it sounds like parody. Many of Hemingway's grandest effects were achieved by understatement; but his lapses warn that even understatement can be overdone.

Hemingway the war-damaged and death-bedevilled. Hemingway the apostle of *nada,* the premature existentialist, for whom life was a dangerous sport, a game sure to be lost in the end, but lost bravely according to Hoyle and Lord Chesterfield. Hemingway the disillusioned champion of Loyalist Spain. Hemingway the artist-magician, the towering talent lavished upon the trapped, the licked and lost, the intrepid and unbelieving. Hemingway the self-destroyed legend of success. Has there been a more poignant tragedy in our time?

In the late summer of that year we lived in a house in a village that looked across the river and the plains to the mountains. In the bed of the river there were pebbles and boulders, dry and white in the sun, and the water was clear and swiftly moving and blue in the channels. Troops went by the house and down the road and the dust they raised powdered the leaves of the trees. The trunks of the trees too were dusty and the leaves fell early that year and we saw the troops marching along the road and the dust rising and the leaves, stirred by the breeze, falling and the soldiers marching and afterward the road bare and white except for the leaves.

—*A Farewell to Arms, first lines*

After I had got them out and shut the door and turned off the light it wasn't any good. It was like saying good-by to a statue. After a while I went out and left the hospital and walked back to the hotel in the rain.

—*A Farewell to Arms, last lines*

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

EXPLORING THE COLD WAR

BY JOSHUA KUNITZ

What is the Cold War? When was it started and by whom? What has been the course of its development? Who has been winning it? What are the prospects for the future? No one interested in these and related questions can afford not to read two recently published works: *From Yalta to Disarmament: Cold War Debate,* by J. P. Morray (Monthly Review Press, 368 pp., $8.50); and *The Cold War and Its Origins,* by D. F. Fleming (Volume I: 1917-1950; Volume II: 1950-1960, Doubleday & Co., 1158 pp., $15 set).

Joseph P. Morray, graduate of the United States Naval Academy and the Harvard Law School (he also studied at St. John's College, Annapolis, and at the Institute of Advanced Studies in International Affairs at the University of Paris), has practiced law, served as a naval officer in World War II and as Naval Attaché in American embassies for five years, and most recently as lecturer at the University of California in Berkeley. In 1959 he published *Pride of State: A Study in Patriotism and American National Morality* (Beacon Press), which examines the subject of patriotism against the background of McCarthyism. The insights he gained from this delving into America's political motivations are amply utilized in his present work, in which the Cold War is studied in only one, albeit the most crucial, of its aspects—the continuing debate between the United States and the USSR with respect to the bomb, the cessation of testing, and disarmament.

D. F. Fleming, Professor of International Relations at Vanderbilt University since 1928 and author of numerous authoritative works in this field, has travelled widely throughout the world, lectured at Cambridge University, and served as an adviser to the State Department. Liberal and humanist, he has dedicated his life's work to the promotion of international amity. This dedication radiates from every page of the present massive study—a vast social-historical panorama of *all* phases of the Cold War.

Both books are inspired by the same abhorrence of war, the same concern for the fate of humanity, and the same determination to avert catastrophe

---

Joshua Kunitz is the author of several books on the Soviet Union and on Russian literature, including *Dawn Over Samarkand* (1935) and *Russia: The Giant That Came Last* (1947).

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

by bringing a greater sense of reality and spirit of accommodation into international affairs. While differing profoundly in scope, philosophical outlook, and style, the two studies complement each other in the facts adduced and fortify each other in the conclusions reached. Together they can serve as a potent weapon in the unfolding struggle for peace.

I

Morray defines the Cold War as a "contest between ideologies," a conflict in which the capitalist West led by the United States, and the communist East led by the Soviet Union, "confront each other in a global stadium, contending for the prize of world leadership." The first phase of this conflict opened on November 7, 1917, with the birth of the Soviet State; the present phase, the Cold War proper, opened in the spring of 1945, with the post-Yalta differences between West and East over the composition of the provisional government of liberated Poland, and came into full bloom with Churchill's bellicose speech at Fulton, Missouri, on March 5, 1946.

The class basis of this conflict is made clear from the outset:

> Powerful forces in Western society have necessarily been locked in an ideological struggle with the Soviet state since its birth as the issue of a revolution that professed to bring a new class to power. The existence of a Soviet government, proclaiming its class-consciousness and emphasizing its unique character as a dictatorship of the proletariat, constitutes a continuing challenge, more or less ominous, to governments of every other type, and a model, more or less compelling, for all people who feel themselves oppressed by other forms of state power. In every Western country there are classes of people who consider proletarian dictatorship calamitous. For such people, struggle against the Soviet state is an imperative of prudence. The Cold War is an intensified phase of their struggle, consequent upon the military debacle of Hitler's anti-Communist crusade. The surprising power of the first socialist state to defend itself from Hitler's onslaught gave notice to all that the Communists' claim of superiority for their social system had to be taken seriously (p. 35).

The Cold War might have long since flared into a hot war had it not been for the dread of nuclear devastation by both sides. Thus deterred, the contestants, perforce, have concentrated much of their energy in ideological combat and verbal rather than nuclear explosions. Less lethal than atoms, words can be mighty weapons in the struggle for the hearts and minds of men. Using his

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

legal training and acumen, Morray focuses his attention on the words employed by both sides. He examines statements, letters, proposals, treaties, political pronouncements; compares and analyzes, delves into discrepancies, uncovers motives, clarifies meanings.

I know of few studies so thoroughly documented as this one. The first substantive chapter, "The Spirit of Yalta," is typical. Out of 27 pages, about 13 (in small type!) are given to the reproduction of the following original sources: a 2-page excerpt from President Roosevelt's report to Congress on March 1, 1945; several sections from telegrams by Roosevelt to Stalin; 2 pages from the Yalta Declaration on Liberated Europe; excerpts from a Churchill missive to Stalin and Stalin's reply; parts of letters from Roosevelt to Stalin and Churchill; almost 5 pages of a message from Churchill to Stalin, followed by a 2-page reply by Stalin; and several quotations from official Washington papers, as well as from books by Churchill, Truman, Sherwood, etc. Add to this the five pages of documents contained in Appendix A, supplementing this chapter, and you have a total of 18 pages of documentation as against 14 pages of analysis! The irrefutable conclusion of this detailed inquest is given in a characteristically terse sentence: "The reader is invited to consider whether that object [the composition of the Polish government which Stalin insisted on] was anything more malign than holding the British and American governments to their Yalta agreement."

The same method and inexorable logic are pursued in all the other 17 chapters, whether they deal with the debate on international control of atomic energy, on suspension of tests, or on disarmament. And the final judgment arrived at is quite as terse and incontrovertible: "A close study of the negotiations over the past sixteen years can lead to only one conclusion: the Soviet Union wants our divided planet to be disarmed; the NATO governments do not."

Needless to say, the procedure Morray has adopted in this book does not make for easy reading. One is summoned to follow a meticulously annotated and closely reasoned argument, to examine and parse long legalistically phrased texts, to compare such texts with seemingly identical yet subtly differing texts. One's powers of concentration and deduction are tried to the utmost, and so, alas, is one's patience. But it is worth it. The result is brilliant illumination.

II

Utterly different in sweep, design, and texture is Fleming's opus. It is hard to categorize it. A possible complaint that it is not formal history may be justified, but it is irrelevant. The work obviously was never conceived as that. While it contains

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

enough historical scholarship to fill any academic with envy—three pages of selected bibliography and hundreds of footnote references—it offers incomparably more than formal history. It is also journalism, sociology, philosophical commentary, polemic, tract, prophecy, program of action, and much else. It is an impassioned, imaginative record and interpretation, a vibrant synthesis of all our anguished generation has lived and read and written and tormented itself over for more than four decades of wars, international and civil, hot and cold, of revolutions and counter-revolutions, of collapsing empires and emerging nations, of A-bombs and H-bombs, of sputniks, luniks, missiles, and spacemen.

The orientation is not, as in Morray's study, on the logic of ideological controversy, but on the logic of events and their causal sequence, on uncovering their roots and tracing their ramifications. The emphasis is on the manifestations of the East-West conflict, on actions and deeds, on the human reactions to them, on the pathos and heartbreak, the bitternesses and enthusiasms. The result is narrative bursting with vivid episode and colorful detail.

Fleming makes you live our intervention in Russia's revolution in 1918 and our simultaneous suppression and persecution of radicals here at home. He makes you rage at the Western abettors and appeasers of the Nazis and brings tears to your eyes as he follows Maxim Litvinov from one international conference to another, vainly pleading, warning, urging collective security upon deaf ears, and finally retiring in defeat upon the expulsion of the USSR from the League of Nations. He makes you shrink in shame when he quotes Senator Truman expressing the hope that the Germans and the Russians would destroy each other and that America would help the Nazis if the Russians seemed to be winning and vice versa; and he makes you blush at Truman's behavior when, shortly after he came to the Presidency, he coarsely assailed Molotov, the Foreign Minister of a victorious ally, on the occasion of the latter's paying him a courtesy visit while on his way to the San Francisco Conference.

The range of coverage is immense. Fully 250 pages are given to the pre-Yalta and Yalta periods (1917-1946), 250 more to the Cold War in Europe, about 200 to the Cold War in East Asia, and about 400 to the Cold War from 1955 through 1959. In this day-by-day, month-by-month account, nothing and nobody of any significance is left out: the "Phony War," the Soviet-German Pact, World War II and the anti-Nazi coalition, the Truman Doctrine, the Marshall Plan, the Eisenhower Doctrine, the Communist seizure of Czechoslovakia, the Berlin blockade, the atomic impasse, the fall of China, the crucifixion of Korea, Indo-China, For-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

mosa, the uprisings in East Germany, Poland, and Hungary, Suez, the U-2 episode, the summit at Geneva, and the frustrated summit at Paris—everything. And, as I have said, everybody—Roosevelt and Hopkins and Churchill and Stalin and Eisenhower and Dulles and Khrushchev and a host of others, generals, statesmen, reporters, commentators (especially Walter Lippmann), Senators, cold warriors, and peace advocates. The whole thing reads like an epic, with each of the thirty-five chapters constituting a complete narrative unit, with characters, plot, and denouement. The reading is easy and absorbing—one is drawn from chapter to chapter, unable to put the book down. And the conclusions stand out sharp and unforgettable:

(*1*) *Responsibility for the origin and continuation of the Cold War rests solely with the West, especially the United States.*

(2) *As of 1960, the West has lost the Cold War.*

(*3*) *To avert a nuclear holocaust, United States policy must be radically altered in a spirit of understanding and sincere cooperation with the socialist countries.*

III

In the passage from Morray quoted above, the reader could not have failed to note the great stress placed there on the "continuing challenge" of the Soviet Union, on the more or less "ominous" character of that challenge to "governments of every other type," and on the "Communists' claim of superiority for their social system." In another passage we read:

> The Communists have deliberately chosen to fight with ideological weapons. . . . The Communists see all history . . . as class struggle. The world, in their view, is still in the throes of a universal revolutionary movement of self-liberation of the exploited masses from the oppression of privileged classes. The process will be accelerated, they believe, as the masses come to recognize the true character of the leaders they have inherited from the past. The Communists have therefore engaged in a vast campaign of exposure. . . . (p. 4).

All this is of course true. One need only recall the very first decree, written and read by Lenin on the night of November 8, 1917, which the Second Congress of Soviets adopted and proclaimed to the world, calling upon the "class conscious" workers of the warring countries to rise in revolt, to bring an end to the war, and, at the same time, to emancipate "the toiling and exploited masses of the population from all forms of slavery and all forms of exploitation"; one need only recall this *Decree of Peace* and the rage and fear it aroused in the ruling circles of Russia's imperialist allies to recognize the truth of Morray's words.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

All revolutions are challenges to established orders, and all revolutions are, in effect, ideologically aggressive, even in a little country like Cuba. But on closer analysis, it seems that much of a revolution's jauntiness and aggressiveness is defensively motivated. And it is this aspect of the matter that Morray neglects.

The corrective is generously supplied by Fleming. Indeed, it is his central thesis that from its birth in 1917 the Soviet Union "reacted *defensively* against the development of events in the West which it [the USSR] could not control." (p. 1036, emphasis mine). This thesis is substantiated throughout the book. The mass of proof is staggering. Freely summarized and interpreted, it amounts to this:

(1) It was Western imperialism that brought on World War I. It was Western imperialism that intervened militarily and financially in Russia's internal affairs in support of the counter-revolution. It was Western imperialism that sought in the years that followed to confine, isolate, ostracize, starve, paralyze the fledgling Soviet state. It was Western imperialism that endeavored to direct its bastard child fascism eastward and thus ultimately dragged the Soviet Union into World War II, a war it had desperately labored to forestall. It was Western imperialism, forced by the war's imperatives into a distasteful coalition with the Soviets, which for almost three excruciating years delayed the *promised* second front in the hope of bleeding the Soviet Union into postwar impotence, and which only opened that front when the victorious Soviet armies had freed their native soil and were marching towards the heart of Europe. It was Western imperialism that upon conclusion of the war (and even while it was still going on) sought to deny the Soviet Union the fruits of victory, a victory for which the Soviet people sacrificed more in life and substance than all of its "allies" put together. It was the Western powers that not only devised the atom bomb, but first used it on Hiroshima and Nagasaki, less to win the war against Japan, which was already all but won, than to intimidate their Soviet ally who, they feared, might become too cocky and obstreperous in the postwar years. And, finally, it was a Western power that, clutching at the secret of the bomb, tried to impose upon the Soviet Union decisions which would place the latter at its mercy—militarily, economically, and ultimately politically. And when that failed, it was the Western powers that unleashed the Cold War with loud whoops about containment, liberation, and roll-back; with all kinds of bellicose "doctrines," the Truman Doctrine, the Eisenhower Doctrine; with globe-circling military aggressive blocs; with hundreds of nuclear bases around the socialist countries; and with shrill blood-curdling threats of destruction and total annihilation.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

(2) In all of the instances listed above, the Soviet reactions were defensive, and it was this that largely contributed to their successful outcome. Thus, in defending itself against foreign intervention and Western-financed counter-revolution, the young Soviet government succeeded in arousing the patriotic-revolutionary fervor of the masses, in building a strong Red Army, and in consolidating its own power to the point of invincibility. Success was complete: the interventionists were tossed out, the counter-revolution crushed; and the sponsors of these adventures were discomfitted in the eyes of the masses the world over. Again, in defending itself against Western attempts to isolate and immobilize it, the Soviet Union forged firm links with the most advanced and revolutionary sections of the working classes and other groups in the countries of their enemies, as well as ties of sympathy and understanding with all the colonial and semi-colonial peoples it could reach. In defense against economic blockade, overt and covert, the Soviet Union, at the cost of incredible self-denial and suffering, accelerated to an unheard-of degree the rates of construction, industrialization, socialization, and technical training. In defense against the menace of imperialist aggression, spearheaded by the Rome-Berlin-Tokyo anti-Communist axis, but aided and abetted by the rest of the capitalist world, the Soviet Union, basing itself on the tremendous achievements of its Five-Year Plans, built up an arms industry and an army that, when it was finally attacked, not only broke the back of the aggressors, but swept triumphantly into Nazi-held citadels of Eastern and Central Europe —Warsaw, Prague, Vienna, Budapest, Bucharest, Sofia, Belgrade, Berlin. In defense against another Western attempt to rebuild around it the old *cordon sanitaire,* the Soviet Union used the enormous prestige of its liberating armies to establish a whole protective tier of friendly socialist states, extending from the Baltic to the Black Sea, to block once and for all the historic passage used by Western armies from time immemorial to invade and ravage Russian lands. And when, contrary to the wise counsel of men like Stimson and Wallace, the United States sought to maintain its monopoly on the terror bomb, the Soviet Union, in self-defense, proceeded with characteristic doggedness to develop its own nuclear weapons and the means of delivering them, surpassing in this the achievements of the West.

(3) The dictatorship of the proletariat was a rather mild regime in the early months of its existence. The highly centralized, harshly coercive, fiercely totalitarian character was forged under hammer blows from the West, was shaped by defensive needs. How else could a vast, sprawling, backward, devastated, multi-national country be made, year in and year out,

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to fight, to work, to build, to lift itself by its bootstraps, to perform the economic, political, military, and scientific miracles it has performed? The purges, the trials, the police excesses, the hysterical suspicion of foreigners, the glorification of Stalin—were these not the defensive reactions of a regime encircled by capitalist enemies plotting its destruction?

(4) America's policy vis-a-vis Communist China is a replica of its earlier policy vis-a-vis the infant Soviet state. And the consequences are much the same—a defensively motivated speed-up in China's socialist development under a highly centralized dictatorial regime. Already, China has emerged as a strong and rapidly growing industrial, agricultural, and military power. Given the revolutionary energies of its 650 million people, its prospects for the future are prodigious, immeasurable.

(5) Two imperialist-engendered world wars, plus the imperialist-provoked wars in Korea and Indo-China, have brought about the Communization of the vast heart of Eurasia—one fourth of the land mass of the globe and one third of the world's population! If fought with conventional weapons, another world war would most likely end up with Communism's global triumph. Small wonder the rulers of the West and, especially, the leaders of the "industrial-military complex" in the United States, are loathe to part with the nuclear weapon. No wonder they dismiss every disarmament or cessation-of-tests proposal advanced by the Soviet Union, and renege on proposals they themselves advance once the Soviet Union accepts them. They simply won't give up. They glory in "brinksmanship"; they swear by the "balance of terror"; they talk darkly about "preventive" and "pre-emptive" wars; they really seem to believe that mankind would be "better dead than red," forgetting that most people in this world know that colors, given time, fade, but that death is death, permanent and irreversible. The peoples vote for LIFE. The Soviet leaders know it and draw strength from this knowledge for their peaceful-coexistence propaganda. As to China's verbal militancy, what is it but a defensive reaction to American aggressive actions in Taiwan, Quemoy and Matsu, in the United Nations, all along her shores and far above her skies?

(6) *Nyet!* How many bitter outcries, how much resentment and contumely, how many sarcasms and wisecracks this so often repeated Russian word in the Security Council of the United Nations has aroused in the American press. The first veto! the twentieth veto! the fiftieth veto! the ninety-ninth veto!—our broadcasters never weary of counting those Soviet vetoes. Rarely is it pointed out that the signers of the Yalta pact and the framers of the UN Charter envisaged Security Council actions as being based

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

on the unanimous agreement of its five permanent members, not on majority votes. This was a protection which America demanded no less than the Soviet Union. It turned out, however, that America could always muster a majority, by hook or crook; while the Soviet Union was always in a minority. We could veto any action distasteful to us by means of a majority which we controlled, while the Soviet Union, being alone, could protect its interests only by a *Nyet,* a prerogative guaranteed it by the Charter. Here again the maligned Russian *Nyet* was a defensive reaction to American actions which it could not control. Things have been changing of late. Now the Soviet Union no longer stands alone. The time is not far off when it too will be able to muster majorities, and then it will be our turn to say *No.*

And so the argument goes. Everywhere we see evidence of the Russian and Chinese defensive stance—in East Germany, in Poland, in Hungary, in Korea, in Laos, in Vietnam, and in Berlin. Not everyone will accept this argument in its entirety. Yet few will deny that it contains much truth, enough to balance Morray's image of a Communist firebrand, waving a red flag, challenging, exposing. Both are the truth, or rather different aspects of the same truth. Action-reaction, offensive-defensive—such is the dialectic of life, a continuum, a chain; and whether you see a particular episode in this chain as one or the other depends largely upon the point at which you start observing and the angle from which you look.

IV

An essential element in the Cold War is of course propaganda. Each side seeks to project a most flattering image of itself and a most repulsive image of its adversary. In this battle of word-created images, that side stands to win whose word-images correspond most closely to recognizable reality. Victories gained through the use of the "big lie," wishful unrealities, or semantic trickery are at best ephemeral and often Pyrrhic. In an excellent chapter entitled "Why the West Lost the Cold War," Fleming lists a number of wishful unrealities about the Soviets which led this country into disastrous political and propaganda errors: Thus, "we relied on our atomic monopoly and discounted Soviet science and industry far too heavily"; "we equated Stalin with Hitler and Communism with fascism"; "we disregarded the power of education and evolution in the Communist lands"; and so on. We tried to deceive others, but succeeded in deceiving only ourselves when we spoke of Communism as an international conspiracy and denounced the Soviet Union as a monster of imperialism and colonialism, of greedy expansionism, a vile land devoid of morality, or decency, or even a suggestion of human dignity and freedom, or any worthwhile

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

art, music, or poetry. This propaganda soon exploded in our faces, as our present vicious propaganda about Communist China is sooner or later bound to do. These are great and flourishing countries. They are not hermetically sealed. People can go there and see for themselves. Slanderous propaganda cannot stand up for very long. When exposed, it boomerangs.

No less self-defeating has been the fancy image we have been projecting of ourselves. Capitalist America? Imperialist America? God forbid! Capitalism and imperialism have become so discredited in the minds of the have-not peoples of the world, so inseparably associated with wars, conquests, exploitation, oppression, racism, economic crises, and similar blessings, that it has been impossible to inscribe them openly on our Cold War banners. Instead, our Madison-Avenue-minded strategists have devised the rousing shibboleth, *Free World*. It is the "free world," led by the United States, ranged against the "enslaved world" of totalitarian dictatorships that lurk menacingly behind the "iron curtain." It is the world of democracy and Godliness, of "individual dignity," of the "open society" and "people's capitalism" and "private enterprise" ranged against Godless Communism, brutal regimentation, and soulless collectivism. To be sure, in the uncommitted countries skepticism abounded. It was hard to envisage a world that included a Franco, a Salazar, a Batista, a Trujillo, a Syngman Rhee, a Menderes, and similar reactionaries and fascists, a society composed largely of colonial empires, as being entitled to the label "free." People everywhere were struck by the paradox that the bold champion of this "free world" and "open society" was itself rapidly succumbing to waves of hysteria, fears, and phobias, was itself abjectly surrendering one of its precious freedoms after another. At the very time it was proclaiming loudly the blessings of individual freedom and dignity, it jailed Communists; persecuted political heretics; imposed restrictions on travel; legislated loyalty oaths; compiled millions of dossiers on American citizens; unloosed a legion of spies, informers, and provocateurs to snoop into the private lives of citizens; spent hundreds of millions of dollars on an army of saboteurs and subversionists abroad; put a clamp on sources of information vital to a democracy; and raised to virtual sainthood the head of the secret police, J. Edgar Hoover, and the chief of the dread CIA, Allen Dulles! More, while proclaiming the blessings of freedom which it itself had long ago won by revolution, it donned the armor of an international gendarme, suppressing or seeking to suppress popular and revolutionary movements wherever they dared to raise their heads, from Guatemala to Cuba, from Laos to Vietnam, from Korea to Iran, in Greece, in Turkey, in the Middle East—

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

everywhere. Again, while it boasted with much justice of the "affluent society" and even of the so-called "people's capitalism," it could not wholly divert the world's attention from the giant monopolies, the power elite, the ascendancy of the military, the endemic unemployment, the blighted cities, the enormous rise in juvenile delinquency, crime, insanity, and divorce rates. Finally, as has already been pointed out earlier in this article, its often iterated devotion to peace was being constantly belied by bellicose actions and jingoistic boasts—American bases and armies and fleets scattered all over the world, insistence on arms supremacy, on alerts, on shelters, and so on without surcease.

How, by comparison, has Soviet propaganda fared? On the whole not too badly, especially among the peoples of Asia, Africa, and, increasingly, Latin America. On the major issues of the age—socialism versus capitalism, national liberation versus colonialism, peaceful coexistence versus nuclear destruction—Soviet propaganda has had the advantage of having to rely less on semantic legerdemain than on directness, candor, and consistency between words and actualities. Proud of their Marxist-Leninist credo, convinced of its scientific validity, sure of its ultimate triumph, Soviet spokesmen rarely felt the need to mask their plans, purposes, achievements, and even failures, behind misleading labels. Their opposition to capitalism, colonialism, and imperialist war was an organic part of their Marxist philosophy and had found consistent, often resounding expression, in every utterance and action of the Soviet Union from the day of its inception. Indeed, it was the Soviet Union's handling as equals of the numerous nationalities that had once been subjugated by Tsarist imperialism, as well as its frequent appeals to the peoples of Asia and elsewhere to rise and overthrow their imperialist masters, that have in large measure inspired many of the leaders of those countries in their long and successful struggle for liberation. Mao, Sukarno, Nehru, Ho Chi Min, Nkrumah, and many of the other outstanding leaders of the formerly colonial and semi-colonial peoples have all to a greater or lesser degree drawn inspiration from the fountain of Marxist-Leninist thought. Also, the Soviets' spectacular rise, within a relatively short time, from backwardness, illiteracy, economic poverty, and military impotence to the great heights it now occupies, served as the best recommendation for socialist organization and planning, especially among the newly-born nations. Soviet propagandists had merely to present the facts to be effective. The image they projected was not divorced from recognizable reality. Herein lay their great advantage. And herein, too, lay the secret of their effectiveness in puncturing the unrealities of American propaganda, the American self-image as well as the American image

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of the Soviets. Morray's findings within the narrow area of his investigation confirm fully what we have just said.

It remains to be seen whether Fleming's flat assertion that (as of 1960) the United States had *lost* the Cold War was not premature. Kennedy's accession to the Presidency has introduced new elements in the American posture and self-image. Also, Khrushchev's sudden renewal of nuclear tests may have injured the Soviet image somewhat. Time will tell.

In closing, let me warn the reader that what I have written is not all book review. Parts III and IV consist largely of my own thoughts suggested by, but not always drawn from, the two books. If this tends to create some confusion, I apologize to the authors and readers. In fairness, I can only urge the readers to turn to the books themselves—for information as well as inspiration, for analysis as well as guidance. Both books are deserving of the closest attention; both courageously present facts and views rarely voiced by American scholars nowadays; both run counter to current preconceptions and Cold War cliches; both are animated by a flaming faith in reason's triumph; and both bear witness to the glory and nobility of the human spirit. Morray's book is excellent within its set limits; Fleming's is, in the words of a letter by Frederick L. Schuman to the editor of *The Nation* (January 13, 1962), "one of the great works of our time"—and, I am confident, of a long, long time to come. Both are *musts* for everyone engaged in the struggle for coexistence in a peaceful world community.

That the struggle is not vain and its aim not chimerical both authors solemnly proclaim in the concluding paragraphs of their respective works. Thus Morray:

> Nevertheless, the cause of disarmament is the cause of humanity. As the peoples of the Soviet Union and the Western world have a common interest in keeping the nuclear bombs from falling, so they have a common interest in eliminating the possibility of their falling. They therefore have a common interest in discovering which parties in the crucial negotiations are really trying to hold on to the bombs and the means of their delivery and which are trying to have them destroyed. This judgment, if reached accurately and in time by enough people all around the world, can save mankind the awful suffering of another war. This is worth fighting for.

And thus Fleming:

> To say that this is utopian or idealistic after the abysmal tragedies of two world wars, and after a thermonuclear arms race is well along, is to invite the oblivion which now hovers over us.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

FRED NEAL ON U.S. FOREIGN POLICY

The following are excerpts from U.S. Foreign Policy and the Soviet Union *by Fred Warner Neal, Professor of Government and International Relations at Claremont Graduate School. This is the best short critique of American foreign policy that we know of; we urge all MR readers to get it, read it, and disseminate it as widely as possible. Sample copies are available free from the Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions, P. O. Box 4068, Santa Barbara, California. Prices for additional copies will be provided on request to the Center.—The Editors*

We have been wrong on just about every major development in the USSR since the Bolshevik revolution. We didn't anticipate the revolution; when it occurred, we didn't think it would succeed; when it was successful, we thought socialism was going to be abandoned; when it wasn't, we thought we wouldn't have to recognize the new Soviet state; when we did, we acted first as if it was like the Western democracies and then as if it was like the Nazis; when the Germans invaded, we thought the Russians could last only six weeks; when they survived the war, we thought they couldn't recover quickly from it; when they recovered quickly, we thought they didn't have the know-how to build missiles, and so on. This record would seem to suggest, at least just a little bit, that perhaps we should not be too positive in other assumptions we have made. . . .

The real failure of American policy was that it was based on the assumption that there was a constant and overriding danger of Soviet military aggression when in fact there was not. . . .

The collapse of Western European colonial power as a result of the war set off revolutionary currents throughout these underdeveloped areas. The United States was inclined to place the blame on the Soviet Union, especially where neutralist and socialist-oriented regimes resulted. We failed to understand that while Communism as a revolutionary force and the Soviet Union as a state may be closely related, they are not the same thing. Our firm assumption of the aggressive and expansive nature of Soviet policy blinded us to the reality that even where the Communists participated, these revolutionary movements were for the most part indigenously originated and motivated mainly by the desire for national independence and internal change. . . .

The implication of American policy is that we are in greater danger from Soviet aggression than from a continuation of the thermonuclear arms race. Unfortunately, the evidence is to the contrary. . . .

One does not have to agree with Soviet proposals to see that the Russian concern over the presence of foreign troops stationed far inside one of their satellite states which the West refuses to recognize is entirely natural. Furthermore, our position in Berlin is highly untenable militarily, diplomatically, and legally. Under these conditions the long-continued failure of the West even to discuss possible compromises on the Berlin issue was irresponsible. . . .

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

MR PRESS is proud to announce the forthcoming publication of

THE RAGGED TROUSERED PHILANTHROPISTS

by ROBERT TRESSELL

The complete and unexpurgated version of this great novel of the working class is here published exactly as the author wrote it. The first account in English of the lives and opinions of a group of working men, written with realism and passion, not by an outside observer but by "one of themselves," it has become a classic.

Robert Noonan, who wrote the book under the pen name of Robert Tressell, was a house painter of Irish extraction who worked for local builders in Hastings, England, in the early 1900's. On the original title page, drawn by the author, there is this subtitle:

Being the story of twelve months in Hell, told by one of the damned, and written down by Robert Tressell.

This is a clothbound book, 633 pages long

Price on publication— $6.00
Prepublication price— $3.25
Order now and save $2.75

Send your order, with payment enclosed, to

Monthly Review Press 333 Sixth Ave. New York 14, N. Y.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Just off the press . . .

Capitalism Yesterday and Today

by MAURICE DOBB

A popular and penetrating study of modern capitalism by Britain's outstanding Marxian economist, who is a Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge University.

80 pages paperback size

Bound in MRP's new flexible cloth binding

Only $1

A bargain for MR readers . . .

Tide Without Turning

by JOHN GILL

Before the Civil War, the battle against Negro slavery was waged by the Abolitionists. Elijah Lovejoy fought for the right to print their side in his newspaper. He was lynched by a mob. This book tells the dramatic story of Elijah Lovejoy and his fight for freedom of the press.

List price—$4.50 256 pages, clothbound

Special to MR readers $2

Send your order, with payment enclosed, to

Monthly Review Press 333 Sixth Avenue New York 14, N. Y.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

MR PRESS BOOKS

		List Price	Price with Sub
CAPITALISM YESTERDAY AND TODAY by Maurice Dobb		$1.00	$6.00
AMERICAN RADICALS Harvey Goldberg, Ed., paper		1.25	6.00
AMERICAN LABOR IN MIDPASSAGE Bert Cochran, Ed., paper		1.25	6.00
MAN'S WORLDLY GOODS by Leo Huberman, paper		1.75	6.00
CUBA—ANATOMY OF A REVOLUTION by Huberman and Sweezy	paper	1.75	6.00
	cloth	3.50	7.00
THE ALIENATION OF MODERN MAN by Fritz Pappenheim	paper	1.25	6.00
	cloth	4.00	8.00
GUERRILLA WARFARE by Che Guevara		3.50	7.00
CROSSING THE LINE by Claud Cockburn		3.50	7.00
AN ESSAY ON ECONOMIC GROWTH AND PLANNING by Maurice Dobb		3.50	7.00
THE JAZZ SCENE by Francis Newton		4.00	8.00
THE WALL BETWEEN by Anne Braden		5.00	8.00
THE CHINESE ECONOMY by Solomon Adler		5.00	8.00
THE POLITICAL ECONOMY OF GROWTH by Paul A. Baran		5.00	8.00
NORTH FROM MEXICO by Carey McWilliams		5.00	8.00
THE THEORY OF CAPITALIST DEVELOPMENT by Paul M. Sweezy		6.00	9.00
THE GREAT ROAD by Agnes Smedley		6.75	10.00
CASTE, CLASS & RACE by Oliver C. Cox		7.50	10.00
FROM YALTA TO DISARMAMENT by J. P. Morray		8.50	11.00

Monthly Review Press 333 Sixth Avenue New York 14, N. Y.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

(*continued from inside back cover*)

criticizing "The Sino-Soviet Dispute" which was the Review of the Month for December. We hope some of the praise was justified, and we are sure that some of the criticisms were well taken. Further discussion would definitely be in order, but we think it can proceed fruitfully only if we can get a candid expression of the Chinese position, not from official sources but from some relatively detached observer who has studied the official materials with care and believes that the Chinese are right. So far we have not been able to find anyone who fits this description and is also willing to commit his views to paper. We will keep looking.

We have received the following letter from our friend Jerome Davis: "Congratulations on the superb job you are doing in keeping the American people informed on foreign and domestic affairs. In keeping with your purpose, we have organized an International Goodwill Seminar which will visit Norway, Sweden, Finland, Russia, Poland, France, and England, meeting with governmental leaders and discussing disarmament and peace. We met with Khrushchev on a previous trip. We leave New York on June 18th and return August 4th. This is a non-profit tour organized just in the interests of peace. We invite any reader of MR to join us. The total cost of everything, New York to New York, is $1,695. The number we can take is limited, so write immediately to: Dr. Jerome Davis, 489 Ocean Avenue, West Haven, Connecticut." We wish the seminar all success.

Readers will note that this is a 64-page issue, the first time we have gone above 48 pages except for special double summer issues. One reason for the increased number of pages is the launching of a Books section which many of you have indicated you would welcome in MR. We would like to go to 64 pages more often in the future but can't afford to do so unless our subscription list increases substantially. We count on you to help.

SUBSCRIPTION ORDER FORM

MR Subscription: 1 year, $5 2 years $9

Subscribe now and we will send you, FREE,
a copy of our special double issue on *Cuba and Communism*

Monthly Review 333 Sixth Avenue New York 14, N. Y.

I enclose:

$5 for a 1-year sub plus *Cuba and Communism*
$9 for a 2-year sub plus *Cuba and Communism*

Name .....

Address .....

City ..... Zone ..... State .....

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

(*continued from inside front cover*)

March. (The hard cloth edition at $5 is still available.) For contents, see back cover.

(2) *Capitalism Yesterday and Today,* by Maurice Dobb. This is a relatively short book, originally written for a working-class audience, which will sell for $1. The author is a Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge University, and is Britain's outstanding Marxian economist.

On the pamphlet front, we have just published *Problems of Disarmament* by six Cornell University professors (Hans Bethe, Douglas Dowd, Mario Einaudi, Walter LaFeber, Philip Morrison, and Jay Orear). These pieces originally appeared as a special supplement to the *Cornell Daily Sun,* and we thought they deserved a wide distribution outside the university community. Eight hundred copies of this new pamphlet were sold on the special train that carried some 1700 stalwart women peace marchers to Washington on January 15, and already orders are coming in from other peace groups. We believe that the pamphlet is a most useful introduction to many of the problems of disarmament, and we strongly urge MR readers to publicize its existence and to persuade groups to which they belong to place bulk orders. For contents and prices, see page 473.

MRP is now distributing John Gill's *Tide Without Turning,* the dramatic story of Elijah Lovejoy and his fight for freedom of the press in pre-Civil War America. This is a $4.50 clothbound book which we are happy to be able to offer to MR readers at less than half the list price—$2.

MRP will soon be publishing a book which many of the oldtimers among you will remember, *The Ragged Trousered Philanthropists,* by Robert Tressell, a novel of working-class life which Tressell's biographer said had "probably made more socialists than any other book." To introduce this socialist classic to American readers we will run in the March issue a "pre-review" by W.H. Ferry of the Fund for the Republic's Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions. "The voice of justice," writes Mr. Ferry, "echoes unforgettably in this chronicle of lives remorselessly chewed up in the wheels of The System. RTP succeeds because it achieves the objects of a work of art; it arouses, convinces, and leads to meditation on its subject." List price will be $6, prepublication price $3.25.

Along with many other publishers, MRP exhibited books in the field of history at the annual meeting of the American Historical Association held in Washington during the Christmas holidays. Shortly afterward the Assistant Director of the exhibit sent a printed report to the participating publishers. It said, among other things: "Sometimes we find selecting the most handled and discussed title in the exhibit a difficult task—but here it was rather easy. *American Radicals* was in someone's hands, or being discussed almost without interruption." Do we need to inform MR readers that *American Radicals,* edited by Harvey Goldberg, is an MRP book? The paperback edition sells for $1.25. (For a list of all MRP paperbacks, plus the new flexible cloth books at paperback prices, see page 466.)

Final piece of MRP news: at the First Annual Exhibition of the Art Directors Club of New Jersey, the prize for "Best in the Category of Book Jackets" was won by MRP's *Guerrilla Warfare,* by Che Guevara. The jacket was designed by our friend Ernie Socolov, and those of you who have the book know that he fully deserves the honor.

We have had more than the usual number of letters praising or

(*continued on page* 496)

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Announcing . . . a reprint of

THE PRESENT AS HISTORY

by PAUL M. SWEEZY

Part I—The Character of Our Epoch

1. The Communist Manifesto After 100 Years
2. Toynbee's Universal History
3. The Illusion of the Managerial Revolution
4. The Marshall Plan and the Crisis of Western Europe
5. Marxism in the East: Decomposition or Enrichment?

Part II—Imperialism

6. A Marxist View of Imperialism
7. Three Works on Imperialism

Part III—American Capitalism

8. Recent Developments in American Capitalism
9. The American Ruling Class
10. Capitalism and Race Relations
11. The Heyday of the Investment Banker
12. Interest Groups in the American Economy
13. The Decline of the Investment Banker
14. Critics and Crusaders
15. Socialist Humanitarianism
16. An Economic Program for America

Part IV—German Capitalism

17. The German Problem
18. National Socialism
19. Post Mortem
20. Resurrection?

Part V—Thinkers and Theories

21. John Maynard Keynes
22. Pigou and the Case for Socialism
23. Hansen and the Crisis of Capitalism
24. Schumpeter's Theory of Innovation
25. Hayek's Road to Serfdom
26. Rosa Luxemburg and the Theory of Capitalism
27. Thorstein Veblen: Strengths and Weaknesses

Part VI—Some Problems in Political Economy

28. Marxian and Orthodox Economics
29. Fabian Political Economy
30. Science, Marxism, and Democracy
31. Strategy for Socialism
32. A Crucial Difference Between Capitalism and Socialism
33. A Reply to Critics
34. Peace and Prosperity

In the new MR Press flexible cloth binding 384 pages

List Price—$2.95

Special to MR readers—$2

Send your order, with payment enclosed, to

Monthly Review Press 333 Sixth Avenue New York 14, N. Y.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED